

Dedicated  
TO  
SIR MONIER MONIER-WILLIAMS, K.C.I.E., D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.D.,  
AS AN EXPRESSION  
OF  
ESTEEM AND AFFECTION, AND \OF GRATITUDE  
FOR  
HIS PRE-EMINENT SERVICES  
TO INDIA  
IN THE CAUSE  
OF  
LITERATURE, PHILANTHROPY AND RELIGION,  
BY  
THE AUTHOR AND TRANSLATORS.





# THE GOAL OF THE HUMAN RACE.

DR. F. R. GRAU.



# THE GOAL OF THE HUMAN RACE

OR,

The Development of Civilisation:  
Its Origin and Issue.

BY

THE REV. DR. R. F. GRAU

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT KÖNIGSBERG, GERMANY.

WITH

*PREFATORY NOTE*

BY

SIR MONIER MONIER-WILLIAMS, K.C.I.E., D.C.L., LL.D., Ph.D.,

BODEN PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

*Translated from the original German (with the approval of the Author)*

BY

THE REV. J. G. DEIMLEP

AND

THE REV. W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL, M.A.

London:

IN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT & CO., L<sup>ds</sup>,  
PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

—  
1892.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
NOTE BY SIR M. MONIER-WILLIAMS .. .. .	x.
TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTORY NOTE .. .. .	xi.
AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE ORIGINAL EDITION .. .. .	xv.
INTRODUCTION .. .. .	xvii.
CHAPTER I.—HAMITIC CIVILISATION .. .. .	1
CHAPTER II.—THE RELIGION OF THE HAMITIC NATIONS .. .. .	25
CHAPTER III.—THE CULTURE-ENDOWMENTS AND PRIMITIVE RELIGION OF THE INDO-EUROPEANS .. .. .	55
CHAPTER IV.—THE RELIGION OF THE SEMITES .. .. .	85
CHAPTER V.—SHEM, HAM AND JAPHETH .. .. .	107
CHAPTER VI.—THE RELATIONS BETWEEN HAM AND THE SEMITES AND JAPHETHITES IN THE EARLIEST TIMES .. .. .	127
CHAPTER VII.—THE GOAL OF THE ANCIENT WORLD .. .. .	153
CHAPTER VIII.—THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE .. .. .	181
--- .. .. .	243



## PREFATORY NOTE

BY

SIR MONIER MONIER-WILLIAMS,

K.C.I.E., D.C.L., LL.D., PH.D.

THE following pages contain a trustworthy translation of a valuable work by Professor Grau, the aim and scope of which are sufficiently indicated by the title-page.

The original work was submitted to me at a time when, not being in strong health, I was unable to peruse it with as much attention as it deserved. Since then I have been prostrated by a severe illness, and during my convalescence I have not felt equal, as I had hoped, to the duty of reading the proof-sheets of the translation even of that portion of the work which relates to my own special department of study.

But I read enough of the original text to convince me that the translation, now put forth for the first time by the Rev. W. St. Clair Tisdall, will be highly appreciated by all who agree with me in thinking that our success in promoting Christianity among Non-Christian peoples—especially in our Indian empire—depends to a great extent on our making ourselves accurately acquainted with the development and present condition of Non-Christian religions and philosophical thought.

MONIER MONIER-WILLIAMS.

LAUSANNE, *October 27th*, 1892.





## TRANSLATORS' NOTE.

THE following able work, by the Rev. Professor Grau, of Königsberg, needs little in the way of an introduction to the English reader, who will, we trust, find much to instruct as well as to interest him in its thoughtful and often eloquent pages. But it may be well to explain in what this English edition differs from the German original. This my fellow translator, the Rev. J. G. Deimler, Bombay, has requested me to do in his name as well as in my own.

Mr. Deimler first read the work in his mother-tongue some years ago, and was so much struck with its value that he wrote to Professor Grau, asking permission to translate it. Professor Grau, in reply, not only gave the requisite permission, but also very kindly re-wrote almost the whole of the concluding chapter, and many passages in other parts of the book, with a view to its improvement. The Professor sent these alterations in manuscript to Mr. Deimler. The work, thus revised, is rendered more valuable than a version of the original unrevised edition would have been, inasmuch as it deals more fully with Brâhmanism, and specially with Buddhism,\* than does the printed German edition. Mr. Deimler's first coadjutor in the work of translating the book was the late Rev. Thos. Carss, M.A., of Bombay,

who gave him much assistance in it. A more careful revision, however, was thought advisable after Mr. Carss retired from the Mission. Accordingly, Mr. Deimler requested me to assist him. We have now thoroughly re-translated the book, and we trust its style in English will not detract from the intrinsic value of the work.

Almost every passage from Holy Scripture quoted in the book has been accommodated to the English *Revised* Version. Only where this would obscure the argument has the rule been in one or two cases departed from.

I have ventured on a very few verbal alterations in two or three places, in order to bring the work as far as I could up to the level of our present knowledge with reference to Assyriology. The spelling (transliteration) of Sanskrit words has also been rendered more exact, and accents to distinguish the long vowels have been introduced. In the Muezzin's cry at the end of Chapter IV., I have translated from the Arabic (as given in the *Mishkât* 'l *Masâbîh*, etc.) instead of from the German, for the sake of correctness. In a few places, where they seemed to be needed, I have also added short notes, appending my own initials to distinguish them from the author's comments. For these things I alone am responsible. The numerous Scriptural references at the foot of the page are due to Mr. Deimler.

It can hardly be expected that, in a work covering so extensive a field, any translator would find himself in entire agreement with the author in every point. I take this opportunity of saying that I think there is very good reason for disagreeing with him on several details in Scripture exposition and historical inference which I do not deem it necessary to discuss as they are of

subordinate importance, on which there is room for diversity of opinion, and do not affect the validity of the argument. In some of the footnotes I have indicated points of divergence of opinion. I have, however, as a translator should, let Professor Grau speak for himself on these subjects. Whatever view we adopt does not materially interfere with his line of argument.

This work of Dr. Grau, while scholarly and worthy of his reputation, is designedly popular in its treatment and style. This may lead the modern critic to question some of his conclusions, and to object to some of his terminology; as for example in his application of the terms *Hamite* and its derivatives to a wider area than that now embraced in recent works on philology. Dr. Grau uses the terms in their popular application to the races of mixed, as well as pure, descent from the son of Noah; which he shews to have been more widely distributed, and powerfully influential, than is generally supposed. That the language of some of them, such as that of the Phœnicians and Carthaginians, was Semitic, by no means proves that they were not of Hamitic origin.

In conclusion, I may be allowed to express our earnest hope that the work may prove acceptable in its English dress, and may enable many readers to recognise in our Lord Jesus Christ the Desire of all nations, and Him who is "the Way, the Truth, and the Life."

W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL.

LONDON, *August*, 1892.



## AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE ORIGINAL EDITION.

THE period of progress, and of the onward march of Culture and civilisation in which we live, demands an investigation of its history. It is natural, therefore, that the author should revert to a theme which was the subject of his first literary effort. The present work is, to a certain extent, connected with that on "The Semites and Indo-Europeans in their relation to Religion and Science," inasmuch as it views the progress of civilisation mainly from an ethnical and psychological standpoint. The author trusts, however, that in this work he has discussed these questions more fully and accurately, as in it he takes into consideration not only the Semites and the Indo-Europeans, but also a third and not less important factor in the history of mankind, namely the Hamites. The Indo-Europeans are thus placed between two opposites; and it is hoped that in this way the unfavourable opinion expressed by some critics with regard to my former work may be considerably modified. The present inquiry will, at any rate, do justice to the facts of the history of the Indo-Europeans by endeavouring to account for the declension of the Indo-European race from its original ideal elevation to its utter degradation

when left to itself, as seen in the individual nations of this stock—the Greeks, the Romans, or the Hindûs.

Moreover, it is not sufficient to engage in archæological investigations alone. Upon the minds of all who do not wish blindly to follow the sophistries of popular leaders in believing in the “universal progress of civilisation,” or in the “necessary advance of the race to ever higher aims,” the present time forces the solemn inquiry: What are the final issues to which the conflicting systems of our day tend? But the author hopes that it is not altogether in vain that, by the light of God's Word, he has sought, amid the intricate maze of history, an answer to this question.

R. F. GRAU.

KÖNIGSBERG, *February*, 1875.

## INTRODUCTION.

**I**S it not a sign of the incipient old age of mankind that people are indulging with such peculiar fondness in thinking about the earliest ages of the human race? In the West, where we live, the lacustrine dwellings have been discovered, and the kitchen-middens of the Progress in Knowledge of Antiquity. aborigines have been examined. In the East, Egypt, Babylon, and Nineveh are again emerging from the obscurity in which they were sunk during what may be termed one of the Middle Ages of mankind. Hieroglyphics and cuneiform inscriptions are being deciphered. The oldest writings of the Indo-European race, the Zend Avesta of the Parsis and the Vedas of India, have been brought to light. Science has everywhere been directing attention to the origin and historical growth of the human family.

It is certain that we live in a new era in the development of mankind. For the first time in human history, it is now possible to speak of the beginning of international intercourse; of a real world-wide civilisation. Let us glance at the close of the ancient period. There existed a grand civilisation in the Roman Empire, but how limited in extent! It was only the larger inlets of the Mediterranean Sea that the Roman world and its civilisation, to a greater or less degree, embraced. The far East

was unchanged ; the Arabian peninsula untouched ; from it Islâm was afterwards to break forth. In Palestine was waged a struggle for life or death ; and, even although the only people which, within the limits of Roman rule, offered any opposition to Roman civilisation, was as a nation destroyed, yet from that nation sprang Christianity, which was destined to gain the victory over Roman sovereignty and Roman civilisation. In Europe itself the Roman legions were crushed by our forefathers in the forests of Germany, and henceforth the Roman language, like Roman law, gave way. Of the New World nothing was then known.

**Our Civilisation** But now the wave of civilisation rolls across  
 is becoming  
 universal. the Atlantic Ocean. The distinction between the Old World and the New will soon be done away with. And what is more, the East is opening up—the cradle of our race and the tomb of the most ancient civilisation. The impossible has come to pass, as in the prophecy in Shakespeare. “Great Birnam wood to high Dunsinane hill shall come against him.” In its death, as in its life, the unchanging East is visiting us. Its stones speak to us, its mummies arise. Over its princes and peoples now for the first time comes the feeling that they can no longer seclude themselves. The most remote Asiatics already, by their contributions, take part in our universal exhibitions.

The East gave to the West its inhabitants and the rudiments of civilisation ; the time of repayment has now come. Christianity, having completed its march towards the West, to the Ultima Thule of the Old World, is now returning to the place of its birth. Europe, through the instrumentality of England, and still more of Russia, is



pressing back to Asia. China and Japan will soon be unable any longer to withstand the civilisation of America, and the Pacific Ocean will be navigated like the Atlantic. Our civilisation is becoming world-wide, and such, in accordance with God's purpose, it must become. Even though centuries may elapse before this end is reached, even though unanticipated hindrances may intervene, it will be reached. For the soul of our civilisation is Christianity, and in the conquest of the world by that civilisation will be fulfilled the prophecy, "In the name of Jesus every knee shall bow."

Modern Christianity. Many of the leading advocates of modern Culture, however, are by no means of opinion that the development and extension of civilisation will advance the cause of Christ. Yet they cannot deny that Christianity has been an essential element in the development of our civilisation, and that to a great extent it continues to hold its old place. But, in their opinion, the progress of Culture will more and more eliminate Christianity, and assist other elements of civilisation to gain the supremacy. They think that the Church may continue her missionary activity among the more barbarous nations at the ends of the earth; but that in the centres of the development of culture she enters more and more into the catalogue of worn-out and conquered powers. If we look at the inner life of civilisation rather than its extension, we observe deeply-rooted opposing forces contending in fiercest strife for the supremacy. It is like a cornfield in which various kinds of grain have sprung up and are now struggling for existence, and seeking to deprive each other of air and light. No age, in fact, reminds us so forcibly as does our own of the great and triumphant words of the

Founder of Christianity, "The field is the world." The present time calls upon us to clear our sight so as to distinguish between the tares and the wheat.

History of  
Civilisation. We live in the age of the composition of the history of civilisation and culture. 'Our Western neighbours, especially the English, are somewhat in advance of us as regards interest in these researches. Although Germany is superior in the completeness and profundity of historical studies, yet a book like Thomas Buckle's well-known "History of Civilisation in England" (especially the Introduction to that work) was able, by carefully carrying out principles—partly erroneous and partly correct—to produce a wide and permanent influence on the reading world of Germany; and that not on the half-educated alone. This predilection for the history of culture is an important trait in the character of the present time. It affords satisfaction to the taste of our age for Natural Science. What Natural Science cannot accomplish—that is to say, the setting forth of such a view of the world as will do justice to the microcosm and embrace what is deepest and highest in humanity and in the departments of Art and Science, Morals and Religion—our age is seeking in the history of Culture. In this, even Science, which, as an investigation of Nature, so readily ignores the deepest questions of the human heart, and sets them aside as unimportant, is obliged to devote itself to the weighty problems of human history. The very pith of the history of Culture is the history of Religion; and, while in these days the majority of people for the most part satisfy themselves by accepting a few of the so-called results of Natural Science as the articles of their belief,

the better educated world is seeking its Gospel in the history of Culture.

The significance which our age attributes to this Science bears testimony to the fact that we have arrived at an important point in the development of mankind. It is felt to be our duty to look back before we press forward, for we stand where highways meet. In fact, the present age can find in history what it needs. For a true comprehension of history is prophecy. When historical Science has brought past events to light, it must at last have knowledge and courage sufficient to say to the present age, as the prophet Nathan said to David, after narrating to him the parable of the rich man who took the poor man's lamb, "Thou art the man." But the moral of the story is not to be taken in the trivial sense of the word, but in its relation to the laws and judgments of God, to which past, present and future are alike subject

What is the  
goal?

As we are engaged in the establishment of a civilisation, world-wide in its height and extent, it assuredly behoves us to inquire what is the goal of this mighty progress. Blindness only can deny that along the heights chasms yawn, and only the basest selfishness can satisfy itself with the saying, "After me, the deluge." Foreign barbarians will never again destroy our civilisation, but in the very bosom of our world of Culture there seem to be springing up hordes which desire to rend it in pieces. The development of mankind does not advance in a straight line to ever nobler aims. The great and noble Græco-Roman civilisation decayed of itself. Why had the history of the world to dash in pieces what it had built up? Why could not that civilisation purge itself

of its defects, and then advance from within as well as without? Why could not the tower be built higher till it reached the earthly paradise, instead of having to be pulled down to be begun anew?

The history of civilisation is now able to give a better answer to such questions than it could in earlier times, not only because it has abundant materials at its command for bringing the ancient civilisation to light, but, what is of more importance, the investigations of our day seek to do justice to the development of Culture amongst the whole of mankind, with reference to both its extent and its primary causes. The Culture of the present day presses forward to become world-wide, and Science is not less comprehensive, nor less active as regards extent and time. It is our age which has been the first to rediscover in its true significance that primæval period of civilisation which is represented by the names of Egypt and Babylon Nineveh, and Tyre and Sidon. We now know that, if we include the present, we must speak no longer of *two*, but of *three*, world-wide civilisations. Not once, but twice, has there been the rise and fall of a great civilisation. We live in the third.

Now, what was the foundation of those civilisations? What their distinguishing characteristics? What the cause of their fall? We are referred to immense differences of race and natural disposition, and still more to deep contrasts in the religio-moral nature, which are more potent than even racial distinctions. nay more, which manifest themselves as the chief causes of the latter. For it was not, as one might imagine, that in the progress of the development of Culture among the nations, Religion gradually attained to greater and wider significance,

while in the earliest times it was of less importance. On the contrary, the earliest information which literature affords us with regard to the life of nations, is either entirely of religious import, or at least permits us to recognise the primary importance which faith in God had for the childhood of mankind. We need then do no more than refer to the fact that the earliest traditions of nations are nothing but mythology; that is to say, all the thoughts and reflections of the human race in its childhood were filled with religion. From moral and religious convictions diverged the different paths of the great civilised nations; by those convictions the aims of their development were determined.

*Influence of  
Religion.*

On the other hand, if we glance at the present and seek to discover the cause of the restless and contradictory struggle associated with the advance of civilisation in our own day, we shall not err, if we conclude that here also the ultimate grounds of difference lie in religion and in the religious aspect of the world. As a matter of course, many ideas are still floating confusedly about, which, from their very nature, must necessarily be utterly opposed to one another. As yet the consequences of the active principles which underlie this struggle are far from being entirely developed, and the goals of the paths which have been struck out are frequently shrouded in darkness.

If we are able to recognise in their essence the contrasts which existed in the Culture of those ancient and primæval times, there will perhaps appear in them deeply-rooted resemblances to tendencies existing at the present epoch, which will yet manifest themselves. Perhaps a clear discrimination between these tendencies in that simple,

primitive age will render our sight keener to perceive the complicated circumstances of our own days. The historical examination of civilisation, as it appears in the destinies of the great civilised nations of the past, may possibly enable us to perceive the ways and ends of our present development. For, although Natural Science through its discoveries gives wings to our Culture for its victorious course over the globe, yet it really knows very little itself where this course will end. It is as if the words of Jesus were spoken especially of the children of our own age, though so much better informed regarding the Kingdom of Nature than men ever were before; "O, ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?"<sup>1</sup>

Let us then, history in hand, fix our eyes upon the ancient civilisations, let us enquire into their origin and progress, and thus seek to gain an insight into the aims and issues of the present development of culture.

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xvi. 3.

# THE GOAL OF THE HUMAN RACE.

## CHAPTER I.

### HAMITIC CIVILISATION.

**T**HE Jewish historian, Josephus, in his work against Apion, exalts the antiquity of the Jewish nation in comparison with that of the Greeks. In fact the political springtime of the Athenian people begins with the legislation of Solon, about the time at which the independence of the Israelitic state came to an end by the carrying away of the people to Babylon, at the beginning of the sixth century before Christ. If we go five hundred years further back, we find the zenith of the history of Israel in the times of Solomon and David, while Greece was still in the dawn of her mythical antiquity, illuminated only by the light of the Homeric poems. Finally, if we go back to the times of the lawgiver Moses, or even to those of the patriarch Abraham (that is, to a period of about two thousand years before Christ), there was no Greek nation with which to institute a comparison.

**Far greater Antiquity of Hamitic Civilisation.** In a similar way to that in which the periods of Greek history stand to those of Israel, we see that the history of Israel appears as fruit of a late growth in comparison with still more ancient nationalities and civilisations. When the patriarchs of Israel still wandered homeless with their flocks and herds, there had long existed great empires and mighty cities round about Palestine. Above all the nations of the earth Egypt towers aloft by reason of the antiquity and importance alike of its empire



and of its culture, and not without reason did the Egyptians regard themselves as the oldest nation upon earth.<sup>1</sup> If we fix the era of Abraham at about two thousand years before Christ, then, as far as we know, the united Egyptian empire began about two thousand years or more earlier still.

With Egypt, however, Babylon and Nineveh vie in the antiquity of the formation of their empires. For, even although we are here more uncertain in fixing the time, yet the genealogical table of nations in Genesis places the beginning of the great world-kingsdoms in the Land of the Two Rivers; and certainly the fruitful plains of Babylon lay nearer to them, when the human race was pouring forth from the East, than did the land of the Nile. To the south of Egypt there existed from ancient times a second great kingdom, Ethiopia, sometimes in dependence upon Egypt, at other times menacing it. Even if one were, erroneously, to derive the culture of the northern state from the southern, Ethiopia, yet, even on this supposition, the high antiquity of the Ethiopian nation may be deduced. It is probable that the Ethiopians, or Cushites as they are called in the Old Testament, passed from Babylon, where the Cushite Nimrod had established the earliest empire, through South Arabia to the Upper Nile; while Egypt was settled from the north. Again, we understand that in the south of Arabia, in Yemen and Sabæa, there existed a very ancient civilisation, which was most closely connected with the people and culture of Babylon as well as of Ethiopia. When we find in the Hebrew historical books mention made of the visit of a queen of Sheba to the King of Israel, we perceive therein the astonishment of a people of ancient civilisation at the power and the peculiar culture of a new nation; while at the same time Solomon employed in the building of the temple the Phœnician workmen of King Hiram, who were skilled in the practice of a very ancient art.

The Phœnicians are the last of the nations which we have to mention here. Their development is evidently, in comparison with that of Babylon and Egypt, of a later date, a

---

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus II. 2.



thing which we might have concluded from the fact that the coast of Syria is not considered their original home. According to trustworthy accounts they came from the Persian Gulf to Canaan, driven from home by earthquakes.<sup>1</sup> Yet the priests, of the Tyrian Hercules told Herodotus that their city and temple had been built 2,300 years ago.<sup>2</sup> Their Tyre and Sidon already appeared as colonial cities, just as at a later time many colonies proceeded from them. Carthage, the most important of all the Phœnician colonies, has a special interest, because the city is the most western, as well as the latest representative, of the culture of the ancient world.

We have here specified only the chief centres of our most ancient civilisation, but in no way have we defined the length of the radii and the extent of their circumference. From the remarkable triangle formed by Egypt, Babylonia, and Phœnicia, issued the broadest beams of light towards all points of the horizon. Referring only to what is of chief importance, we find a fairly broad belt of culture extending from Egypt along the northern coast of Africa as far as to the Canary Islands, covering the ground which is now occupied by Islâm in Africa. It is well known how far the settlements of the Phœnicians and their commercial intercourse reached in the north-west of the ancient world. Asia Minor, in the earliest times, was wholly, or at least to a very great extent, dominated by this civilisation. The northern coast especially, and the districts of the neighbouring Caucasian Mountains, with their great wealth in metals, maintained an active intercourse with those great centres.

From Mesopotamia the influence of Babylon extended to the whole south of Arabia and to the north of Media and Bactria, and ultimately away to the south-east coast of the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean. We shall have to consider further on that the Âryans or Japhethites of India, on their entrance into that country, met with a culture which, in its essence, shares the same character as that of the nations named above,

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus II., 44.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, I.,

and which has been of no slight influence on the development of the Aryan Hindús.

In conclusion, distant China should here be taken into consideration. That land alone can boast of a culture which, as to age and importance, admits of comparison with those which have been previously mentioned, as it seems also in its nature to be most intimately connected with them. Of special importance is the fact that the Chinese nation alone has preserved a series of traits which disappeared long ago in the fall of Babylon, Tyre and Memphis. It now appears not impossible that in the earliest antiquity the germs of a primitive civilisation were carried from Babylon as far as to China. Perhaps, however, China and the western lands which we have mentioned borrowed the elements of their culture from a common original source, which we must conceive of as existing in the central portions of Upper Asia, whither Chinese traditions point back. What is quite clear to us is, that from whatever source her civilisation may have sprung, China has never exercised any material influence upon the Western world. The course of the world's history with which we deal is independent of China; we shall, therefore, in the sequel, leave that country out of consideration.

Hamites never passed through a savage or nomadic state. In now proceeding to describe the state of culture in those countries, we must for the present omit one matter which is of peculiar importance to us in dealing with the two other great families of nations, the Semites and the Indo-Europeans. With regard to these peoples, we are not acquainted with their development and transition from a condition which we are in the habit of regarding as the very opposite of civilisation, or of any kind of political organisation. As soon as Egypt and Babylon meet us in history, they present themselves to us as centres of civilisation. We never find these nations in a nomadic state; on the contrary, we find them a people settled and devoted to agriculture and industry; they already, from the earliest times, present a contrast to the wandering hordes of the Semites and Indo-Europeans. We may fairly presume that these races, immediately upon the dispersion of mankind after

the Flood, appropriated to themselves, with a sudden bold swoop, the regions peculiarly adapted for agriculture, especially the low grounds near rivers. Here, depending on the bounties of Nature, could at once be procured, by means of the scanty resources which, in that most ancient period, men had at their command, such abundance as the development of culture presupposes. But their taking possession of those places did not happen by chance, but, on the contrary, came to pass through a well-directed purpose, from a special bent of mind. On the original form of Hamitic culture we may base a conclusion with regard to the primary characteristics of civilisation in general. However, this does not belong to this place, but to the end of our historical discussion.

Here we must anticipate another result of historical investigation, which is regarded as certain by unprejudiced investigators of different tendencies. That is the essential oneness, the intrinsically similar character, of the civilisations of the nations mentioned above, but which, on the other hand, does not exclude a considerable diversity in external relations. Let us compare the very different phenomena presented by two nations, which come under consideration here—the Phoenicians and the Egyptians; the former boldly navigated the wide ocean, the latter dreaded it as “Typhonic.”<sup>1</sup> The one people carried on commerce with all nations, and through their colonies felt, as it were, everywhere at home; the other shut themselves up on the holy soil of the Nile, and secluded themselves from all the rest of the world as if it were unclean. And yet Plato classes the two nations together, and attributes to them both “a thirst for gain,” while he contrasts them with the Greeks, for whom he claims “the love of knowledge” as a characteristic peculiarity.<sup>2</sup> F. Müller attributes to the Hamites<sup>3</sup> “a mind entirely sunk in materialism,” and a partiality for the deification of Nature, as is found in their religion, and the practice of

<sup>1</sup> The Egyptians regarded the sea as sacred to the evil spirit *Sct* or *phop*.—W. S. C. T.

<sup>2</sup> Republic, Book IV., § 11.

<sup>3</sup> Fr. Müller, “Allgemeine Ethnographie,” p. 487

embalming the dead, and considers their achievements in agriculture and industry as similar to those of Chinese civilisation.

Let us begin by setting forth the most important points in the Hamitic civilisation, and then attempt to comprehend its general character.

**Agriculture due to the Hamites.** Mankind owes to the Hamites the first great development of agriculture. It was not merely to the fertility of the lowlands that their agricultural success was due, but rather to their rational system of management. Perhaps Chinese agriculture should also be traced back to the primitive original source from which sprang that of the Hamitic nations. It is well known, as the great chemist Liebig has shown, that the Chinese surpass all modern peoples in their rational method of agriculture. An agricultural literature sprang up among the ancient Hamites also at a very early period. There are remains of trustworthy accounts in regard to this matter on the side of the youngest branch of that great family of nations. We have numerous witnesses among the Roman and Greek writers to the importance of the Carthaginian agriculture and the Carthaginian agricultural literature. We read that, after the conquest of Carthage, the Romans made over to the allied princes of Africa the libraries which they found there, with the exception of Mago's great work on agriculture.<sup>1</sup> This work, in twenty-eight books, treated of all branches of agriculture, as, for example, of the tillage of the ground, arboriculture, and especially the cultivation of the vine, the breeding of cattle, the management of bees, and veterinary science. In accordance with a decree of the Senate, it was translated into Latin by D. Silanus.

The fact that Mago's work appeared to the Romans so important that the Senate honoured in this way a representative of the hostile nation, and that the Roman writer on agriculture, Columella, could call the Carthaginian "the father of agriculture," presupposes an earlier development of this

---

<sup>1</sup> Pliny, *Natural History*, XVIII., 3.

branch of civilisation.<sup>1</sup> And if, as Heeren thinks, Mago was a contemporary of Cyrus, we may infer how far back in antiquity the Carthaginian science of agriculture lands us. From later descriptions (those of Diodorus and Polybius) we see that the country around Carthage was covered with the villas and estates of the nobility of the city; and we receive the impression that here existed conditions very similar to those found in modern England. We cannot but suppose, however, that the art of agriculture, like other industrial pursuits of the colony, had been derived from its mother city. Moreover, it is not likely that Phoenicia had been especially inventive with regard to agriculture. The Phoenicians in this, as in many other branches of civilisation, were merely the missionaries and intermediaries of the most ancient Hamitic nations, particularly of the Babylonians and Egyptians.

With regard to the Babylonians, this conclusion is supported by the remarkable Book of Nabathæan Agriculture. It is certain that this book, as it exists in the Arabic language, though professing to be a translation from the Babylonian, is the forgery of an Arabic author. On the other hand, its existence would be inexplicable, had we not known that ancient Babylonian writings on agriculture still existed in later times among the Arabs or Arabicised Chaldeans. Better known is the high state of the development of agriculture in Egypt. Pictures dating from the times of the Ancient Empire enable us to know it in its details. Five different kinds of plough were used. Besides other products of the field, flax, lotus, figs, and wine were gathered, and the art of breeding cattle seems to have been not less developed. We see herds of horned cattle, asses, sheep and goats, as well as poultry in great abundance.<sup>2</sup>

\* **Rise of Sciences.** With an extremely advanced application to husbandry, however, such as under the very favourable conditions of Mesopotamia and the land of the Nile became possible, and in fact necessary on account of the

<sup>1</sup> Columella says (I. i., 13) that the Greeks also had already translated Mago and written on the subject.

<sup>2</sup> M. Dunker, "Geschichte des Alterthums."

populousness of those countries, there are associated a series of industries and sciences, which were in the first instance in the service of agriculture, but which have in some measure an importance of their own. In Egypt particularly, but also in Babylonia, the fruitfulness of the soil depended upon the inundations of the great rivers. When the Nile left on the fields its valuable deposit of mud, it at the same time obliterated their boundaries. On this account a system of surveying had to be developed, and thus were laid the foundations of geometry.

The endeavour to extend as far as possible the inundation of the river, and thus to wrest from the desert fruitful land, originated the art of irrigation, and gave rise to the science of hydraulics. Agriculture teaches people to pay regard to the seasons and the motions of the constellations. In Egypt, the existence of the whole nation depended upon the overflowing of the Nile, which usually takes place with great regularity at a certain season of the year. This led to the development, in the land of the Nile and in Babylonia, of the science of constructing almanacs and that of astronomy. It is highly probable, however, that the sciences of astronomy and geometry took their rise from the altar and divine worship; for with the religion of the Hamites was closely connected, as we shall see further on, the observation of the stars and the orientation of temples. But the agriculture of those nations naturally took these acquirements at once into its service, and still further developed them.

Agriculture rises to higher stages of development, as China shows, in countries noted for the density of their population. Again, the increase of the number of the people depends upon the increased productiveness of the soil. A population multiplies in a special degree when it not only disperses itself over the open country, but also collects in cities which are dependent upon the agriculture of the country people. The commencement of city life must be traced to the Hamitic nations, in contradistinction to the Indo-Europeans and Semites, who for a long time devoted themselves to cattle-breeding and a nomadic life, or remained at the lowest stage

Founding of  
Cities.



of the art of husbandry. Quite a number of the towns of Egypt are extremely ancient, and not less so those cities of Mesopotamia which are mentioned in the genealogical table in Genesis, among others, Accad, Babylon and Nineveh. Of more recent date are the colonies of the Phœnicians, Sidōn and Tyre, besides other towns on the Phœnician coast; and yet how old in comparison with any towns founded by the Indo-Europeans or Semites.<sup>1</sup> The whole of Hamitic civilisation seems from the very beginning to have been based upon the recognition of the great difference between town and country life, or at least to have presupposed it. Babylonia took its name from its chief town. The importance of Phœnicia and Carthage depended upon their cities.

**Advance of Civilisation.** With the distinction of town and country first begins, in a higher degree, the division of labour and what we call civilisation. The industries of life advance side by side with husbandry. Similarly there is formed a class of priests and scholars; whereas, in families living in a nomadic state, or in a population dispersed over the open country and tilling the ground, the father of the family himself has to care for religious as well as for secular concerns. The Hamites were prominent as industrial nations. Investigations in Egypt and Mesopotamia show us from time to time more and more clearly the importance of their achievements. Among the productions of Egyptian industry we may here mention the following: Robes of *byssus*—far famed in ancient times—glass ware, instruments of bronze and golden ornaments. The sober Max Dunker says of Egyptian industries, that they were not much inferior to those of modern Europe. The industrial skill of Babylon also vied with that of Egypt. Highly renowned from antiquity were their garments and carpets, their ointments and cut stones. They worked in wool from Arabia, and used Arabian and Indian spices. Better known are the productions of Phœnician industry: their purple dye, their glass-making, their pottery, their manufactures in bronze, and the work of their jewellers in gold, ivory, and amber.

---

<sup>1</sup> Herod. II., 109.

We shall now direct our attention to a peculiarly important subject—one of the most prominent bases of all civilisation, of all industrial energy, and of all commercial intercourse—

the existence of a system of coinage, measure, and weight. In this respect Babylon holds for the whole of the ancient world a position similar to that which Paris occupies for the modern. Distinct traces of the Babylonian system of measures have remained up to the present time, and will probably remain for ever. What Boekh had already affirmed has recently had clearer light thrown upon it by Brandis.<sup>1</sup> As in our own time the decimal system is continually forcing its way more and more to the front, so Babylon produced for the old world the duodecimal system.

“Like many other nations of the earth,” Brandis says, “the Babylonians, apparently at a very early period, by comparing the periods of revolution of the sun and moon, and observing that the revolution of the sun is completed in about twelve of those of the moon, were led to divide the year into twelve months, and proceeded to apply the duodecimal division to the measures of time and length. The Greeks, as is well known, borrowed from them the division of the day into twelve parts,<sup>2</sup> and also the yard of twenty-four fingers’ breadth is Old Babylonian.” Yet the Babylonians had evidently a comprehension of the significance of decimals; and thus they found in the number sixty, the ruling number of their system, the entrance of a distinct link of connexion between these two arithmetical principles.

The Babylonian sexagesimal system gives, like our own, to each numerical figure a value dependent on its position; and its greater divisibility is an important advantage. But it appears especially valuable inasmuch as it fixed not only the measures of space and substance but also those of time, and that it has maintained the latter even up to the present day in opposition to the metric system. “The dial-plate of each of

<sup>1</sup> I. Brandis, “Das Münz-Mass-und Gewichtswesen in Vorderasien bis auf Alexander den Grossen.”

<sup>2</sup> Herod. II., 109.



our watches is, unknown to us, a living witness to this Babylonian wisdom." The calculation of the value of the German florin, and the German method of reckoning by sixties, rest on the Babylonian numerical system; and the circle is still divided into sixty degrees.

If we look further into the matter of weights, Brandis declares, "Nothing is clearer than the Oriental origin of the Greek system of weights. If the expressions Mina and Stater, of which the one is derived from the Aramaic, the other is a translation of the synonymous Semitic word Shekel, indicate that fact, then in particular the peculiar division, of which the base is sixty, leads us to conclude that it is derived from Babylon. In the sixteenth century before the Christian era, the Babylonian Mina was already current in Mesopotamia and Syria." Here, also, more recent investigations have supplied us with very highly important evidence.

The Assyrian weights, which Layard has dug up from the ruins of Nineveh, show a very exact adjustment, and are on this account superior to all relics of this kind which have been found in Greece and Italy. The inhabitants of Mesopotamia, in inventing a system of measure and weight complete in itself, were guided by a delicate sense of perception of the smallest differences and the most simple relations of measure and number, which evidently led their artisans also to dexterity in their industries.

**Asiatic Greeks invent Coinage.** If, finally, we look at the use of money as the measure of value, we find that the Greeks of Asia Minor were the first to invent a coinage; yet the Hamites, also, have done much in this matter. While in Italy and Greece, cattle and, at a later period, the baser metals originally served instead of money, those ancient nations had, from the remotest times, made use of the only materials which answer all purposes, and which have therefore ever retained their position, namely the precious metals, gold and silver; only that in Mesopotamia, as in Egypt, in place of coined money, weighed money was used.

We have treated this subject the more fully, since we are here not dealing with what are merely things of the past.

The industrial activity of those countries may have been surpassed at a subsequent period, but single traits of that great sway which civilised man exercises over space and time, and the things therein contained, have remained, and are likely to remain for ever. This holds good also, in some measure, of a sphere which we have already mentioned, and to which we have once more to return. We remarked that the Babylonians very early, perhaps first of all, fixed the year of twelve months.<sup>1</sup> The Babylonian calendar, like Mesopotamian civilisation in general, was accepted far and wide. Thus the Hebrew names of the months coincide in the main with the Babylonian. Although in this respect the last great empire of the ancient world, the Roman, has stamped its impress on our calendar, yet this does not hold with regard to the days of the week. Of the seven days, which among the Babylonians had been from the remotest times dedicated to their gods, the seven planets, the greater number still bear among us also the names of the Babylonian star-gods. Thus, unsuspectingly, do day and hour connect us, children of the present, with the remotest past.

But we have still to call to mind a far more important foundation of all civilisation, for which we are indebted to one of the Hamitic nations—that is, the invention of writing. It is well known that the Greek alphabet has been traced back to the Phœnicians, and that the invention of letters was generally attributed to them by the Greeks. However, before speaking of this let us say a word about the Phœnicians themselves, and of their relation to the whole of Hamitic culture. To this nation are attributable special branches of archaic civilisation. We find among the Phœnicians (and this is an acknowledged fact) the first great improvements in navigation, in commerce, and in colonisation. From India to the shores of the Land of Amber in the North, and from the Caucasian mountains to beyond the Pillars of Hercules, their caravans travelled and their fleets sailed. But

<sup>1</sup> According to Herodotus II., 4, the Egyptians claimed to have invented the year of twelve months.

in all this they were only carrying on further and perfecting what Babylon and Egypt had already begun at an earlier date.

The special importance of this people lies in their activity as intermediaries between nations, particularly those of another race. The Phœnicians were the missionaries of Hamitic culture. What Egypt and Sheba, Babylon and Nineveh had produced, the Canaanites exported<sup>1</sup>. Thus, the Phœnician discovery of writing is not contrary to this characteristic trait in their nature. Far more ancient than the Phœnician alphabet are the hieroglyphics of the Egyptians or the cuneiform writing of the Assyrians and Babylonians.

**Hieroglyphics  
and Cuneiform  
characters.**

A pictorial system of writing universally precedes all alphabetical writing. And all writing originally proceeds from the sanctuary, or is a holy script. It serves first to express divine or religious mysteries as well as to conceal them. For it is at first the writing of the priests, invented by them and employed for their purposes. We see this plainly among the Egyptians.

Now, the peculiar character of the Phœnician alphabet, in contradistinction to those more ancient systems of writing, consists in its wholly profane character. The Phœnician writing has nothing to conceal; it *will* and *must* be adopted by the whole world. What among the Egyptians and Babylonians remained more or less peculiar to the priests, became among the Phœnicians the writing of merchants. It is certain that along with the earliest products of industry the men of Tyre and Sidon at the same time spread abroad the knowledge of the alphabet. Among the sons of Ham, Canaan especially became the elementary teacher of the nations. From the Phœnician alphabet were developed the Semitic, the Græco-Italian alphabets—nay, more, the Germanic Runes, and even the grand Sanscrit alphabet of the Indians. King Hiram's artisans directed the building of Solomon's temple, and the Old Testament was written in Phœnician letters. And, finally, from a son of Ham were handed down the wonderful charac-

<sup>1</sup> Herod. I., 1.

ters through which the poems of Homer were preserved to us, and through which the New Testament was spread abroad among the nations. They were the vessels in which the intellectual streams of Shem and Japheth were to be contained and kept for the remotest times.

**Hamitic Literature.** But did those nations, then, whom we have to thank for the invention of writing, possess no literature themselves? Wonderful to relate, not a single writing, nor any really comprehensive memorial of their genius, has reached us directly from the Phœnicians themselves. It seems as if the curse had rested on the literature of these inventors of writing. There remain only a few stones from the ruins of Carthage, some votive tablets, or a sarcophagus (as that of the Phœnician King Eshmunazar) with their private contents. To this we may add the few fragments of Carthaginian or Phœnician literature which have been preserved to us by the Greeks and Romans.

Notwithstanding this, we know that Tyre, like Carthage, possessed a rich literature. There was there no lack of works of a historical or mythological character. In particular, there must have existed a large supply of books on practical subjects, as we might have inferred from the character of the people, and as is proved by the existence of the above-mentioned book on agriculture. They must also have been rich in works of a geographical and ethnological purport. A very remarkable memorial of the first kind is preserved to us in what is called the *Periplus of the Carthaginian Hanno*, who narrates his voyage of discovery through the Pillars of Hercules and along the West Coast of Africa. Yet for by far the most important relic of Phœnician knowledge we have to thank not the Phœnicians but the Hebrews. The marvellous tenth chapter of Genesis, which is called the genealogical table of nations, may be understood to have been drawn up with the help of Phœnicians who in their travels had seen "the cities and manners of many men."

To what a high antiquity does this survey of nations in the eleventh century before Christ carry us back! And what vast disclosures do we receive regarding the different paths which

the human race has taken ! Yet the bold navigators of Tyre and Sidon have in this no other merit than Hiram's workmen in building the temple of Jehovah. The Spirit which moved in both these matters was the Spirit of the God of Israel. The knowledge of the human race which the Phœnicians had acquired had, as it were, grown out of mercantile intercourse, and so it was intended to be useful only in this way and for the self-interest of this nation of traders ; it therefore deserved to perish. The information which the Hebrews gained from them was placed at the service of the history of Redemption, and, being connected and filled with God's eternal plan of salvation, was for that very reason immortalized.

A far richer and more comprehensive literature still may be supposed to have existed among the Egyptians and Babylonians, those nations of the most ancient wisdom. Ever more numerous and important grows the collection of hieroglyphics as they are gathered from the monuments of stone in the valley of the Nile, and also from manuscripts which have been discovered. Still greater astonishment has been caused by the discovery of the whole library of an Assyrian king among the ruins of Nineveh. The English Layard has found the library of King Assurbanipal, dating from the seventh century before Christ. This consists of from ten to fifteen thousand clay tablets, which are covered on both sides with cuneiform writing. These tablets, when still soft, were impressed by means of metals stamps, which have been discovered in numbers. The tablets, being then baked in the kiln, could be preserved for an unlimited time.

It is no longer possible to doubt that for the purpose of reproducing those tablets in great numbers, special printing instruments were used, by which the cuneiform writing was impressed upon the soft clay. These tablets were used in the schools of the priests and learned men, and contained numerous translations or explanations of words taken from the various languages of Assyria and Babylonia and Accad. We must, therefore, attribute the invention of a kind of printing to these ancient inhabitants of Mesopotamia. The contents of those numerous tablets, which once formed the royal library, have

Egyptian and  
Babylonian  
literature.

as yet been deciphered only in part ; nevertheless we are able to speak in general terms on the subject. They treat, to a great extent, of mythological, magical, and astrological subjects, but they also show us the astronomical, mathematical, grammatical, and historical acquirements of the Assyrians. Finally, they possessed a science of jurisprudence, of statistics, and of Natural History. And the knowledge of these branches of learning will certainly, on fuller investigation, be considerably extended.

A yet richer literature must have been possessed by Babylon and some other ancient seats of learning in Lower Mesopotamia, for Babylonia was rather the giving and Assyria the receiving portion of the Land of the Two Rivers.

**Value of this Literature.** Let us now form an estimate of the value of this literature. New discoveries, and the progressive decipherment of the cuneiform writing, will assuredly give us important disclosures in relation to many matters. We shall gain a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of the old Babylonian and Assyrian religion. It will become continually more and more clear how extensively there had been developed in very ancient times a material civilisation, of which we have already been enabled to apprehend the importance from its system of weights and measures, regarding which we have already spoken. We shall entertain a much deeper respect for the acquirements of those ancient nations in the sciences of astronomy, mathematics, and similar subjects. We shall receive surprising disclosures regarding the earlier history of Western Asia. It will be seen that in Assyria and Babylonia a peculiar description of poetry existed, perhaps, indeed, a kind of Epos.<sup>1</sup>

What is most important, there will be perceived in their mythology numerous significant parallels with the Old Testament traditions ; parallels which coincide far more directly with the Old Testament than do the distant harmonies of Indo-European mythology. For as Ham and Shem are much

<sup>1</sup> Compare the episode of "Istar's descent into hell," edited by Prof. Eberhard Schrader.



more nearly connected with each other geographically than are Shem and Japheth, so the striking contrast between these two families of nations arose on the ground of an original nearer affinity to one another, just as often happens in the life of individuals. Thus the decipherment of a number of cuneiform tablets from that library, containing an account of the Flood, has justly attracted the greatest attention. In this connexion it will constantly become more clear that the relation between Hamitic and Semitic traditions is similar to that which exists between the temple of Jehovah in Jerusalem and that of Baal at Tyre. Both being built of the cedars of Lebanon, they show a no slight resemblance, even in style, because Tyrian artisans worked at both.

We may say something similar with regard to Egypt. Here also will be manifest a great abundance of points of contact with the Old Testament. But here also we shall perceive that, although Shem and Israel were instructed in the forms of Hamitic civilisation, yet into these forms there was breathed an essentially different spirit. In other respects also the literature of Egypt will show itself ever richer and more varied. We can already form a conception of their medical literature, and find the justification of the reputation which the Egyptians in ancient times enjoyed as physicians, and especially as oculists. According to Herodotus (II., 82), each malady had its own doctor. It is probable that in the departments of poetry, fables and narratives were very numerous. A good example of these is the history of the cunning thief who stole the king's treasures,<sup>1</sup> and other stories of the same kind have been found.

A particular class of fables is peculiar not to the Egyptians only, but to the Hamitic nations in general. These are the tales in which animals appear as speaking and acting. It is well known that the Greeks traced these back to Æsop. Now, the name "Æsop" is probably nothing else than the national name "Æthiop" (which corresponds with the word "Cush," used in the Old Testament) changed into a proper name. The

<sup>1</sup> Herod. II., 21.

name Cush comprised the Hamitic tribes dwelling in the south of Egypt, and scattered throughout the south of Arabia as far as India.

If we now consider the use which the Egyptian system, of writing made of pictures of animals, and the intermingling of the animal with the human and the divine as found in Hamitic art and religion generally (as well in the Egyptian as in the Babylonian), we shall be well able to understand the origin of this peculiar kind of poetry from Hamitic civilisation. As among the Greeks Æsop appears as the introducer of this kind of Hamitic literature, so the Arabs trace similar fables back to Luqmán, who belonged to the ʿAdites, a Hamitic tribe dwelling in the south of Arabia. In India also it seems that we must trace back a particular class of narratives to the Sūdras, who must be regarded as distinctly Cushites, or at least their civilisation must be derived from Hamitic sources.<sup>1</sup> In spite of their fantastic dress, these fables are characterised by good sense and prudence, or a frigid morality, upon which the action turns. This corresponds perfectly with the nature of the culture which we have so far described. The Germanic animal fables are derived from France, and are in themselves of Oriental, that is to say of Hamitic, origin.

**Painting and Sculpture.** We have still to speak of the arts of painting and sculpture among these nations. In this connexion we have especially to consider the Egyptians and Assyrians, since of the monuments of Babylonia, Phœnicia, and of Sheba, little remains, or what does remain has not yet been rediscovered. The numerous monuments of Egyptian art have, on the other hand, astonished observers of every century, and they have been augmented by new discoveries in our own day. Assyrian works of art again have been suddenly brought to light, like a new world, through the researches of learned Englishmen and Frenchmen, to the astonishment of all. Centuries before any art had arisen in Greece, Assyrian artists had produced these works. We cannot as yet fix precisely how

<sup>1</sup> Renan, "*Histoire générale et Système comparé des langues Sémitiques*," Paris, 1855, I., 301. The author refers especially to the Hitopadesa.



far back this development extends, the latest productions of which have again appeared before our eyes. With regard to Egypt, on the other hand, we know that the antiquity of its works of art exceeds the products of Greek art, not merely by hundreds but by thousands of years.

If we look at the peculiar nature and importance of the fine arts in Egypt, we shall be much struck with the extraordinary size of many of their productions. To this the Pyramids still bear witness, as do the ruins of many temples, those of the Labyrinth, and even those of the still remaining colossal statues. With vastness of extent is united in several of the works the quality of imperish-

ableness, and, so to speak, an eternal durability.  
**The Pyramids.** Wonderful that the works of art of the most ancient civilised nation should be both the vastest in extent and the most successful in bidding defiance to the assaults of Time. As an Arabian proverb says, "All things fear Time, but Time itself fears the Pyramids." These two qualities impress the beholder with a sense of the sublime, while the statues allow us to infer a highly developed technical knowledge. What we might call artistic handicraft was indeed, in Egypt, extended to a degree which we can compare with nothing but the building guilds of the Middle Ages. As Diodorus informs us, the various parts of a statue might be worked at by various sculptors at different places in such a way as to make the statue appear to be the exclusive work of one artist. They worked according to a most accurately calculated geometrical division of the body.

Egyptian art must be credited with great fidelity to Nature. We find the types of foreign nationalities most admirably represented. In a word, we may say that the Egyptian nation worked as if through a natural instinct—with the precision and accuracy of Nature—though at the same time under restraints. As bees build their cells, so the Egyptians practised their art. Among the Greeks also, art depended upon hereditary transmission from generation to generation, but from this foundation there afterwards sprang the individuality and genius of the artist. Although among the

Egyptians there may be noticed a progress and declension in art at different periods, yet we cannot name individual artists.

**Mesopotamian and Assyrian Architecture.** With the Egyptian edifices may be compared, in regard to their extent, the terraced towers, *temple-towers* and palaces of Babylonia and Assyria.

The perishable nature of their building materials, consisting of sun-dried or burnt bricks, prevented anything but ruins being left to us; besides, the employment of this material did not permit them to emulate the grandeur and nobleness of Egyptian architecture. On the other hand, the Assyrian sculptures which have been discovered surpass, in some respects, the works of Egypt. Yet more distinctly impressed upon them do we find the character of realism, and, at least in animal sculptures, this realistic art gains real triumphs. We have in this connexion but to mention the Assyrian lions in Layard's great work. While Assyria found the necessary material for its plastic works in the not very distant mountains, we see that Babylonia was compelled to depend entirely upon burnt clay. Thus, in Babylonia especially, there was developed a peculiar kind of enamelling and encaustic painting. We may conclude that the employment of this art was very wide-spread. Unfortunately, however, the condition of the immense masses of ruins does not permit us to duly recognise the importance of these works.

The art of Sheba and of the Hamites in South Arabia also seems to have been of great importance. This is indicated not only by Arabian legends about the Adites and their King Sheddâd, but also by the ruins which still exist. A recent explorer has discovered in Marib pillars which are of great antiquity, and the simple and graceful form of which justifies this supposition.

**Political institutions.** A consideration of the political and social institutions of the Hamites, which embraced the whole of their civilisation, may form the conclusion of our enumeration of the most important elements of culture. We do not find everywhere the same political organisation. Among the Canaanite tribes there never seems to have been a united

monarchy, as we see it in Egypt or in Mesopotamia. In Canaan, as well as among the Phœnicians, there existed rather a federal league of single towns; and again, within the towns, a sovereignty limited by the aristocracy. Among the Carthaginians the aristocratic side of the Phœnician constitution seems to have been most freely and extensively developed, since they had no king. Aristotle prefers the Carthaginian constitution to those of most of the Greek states.<sup>1</sup> Among the Phœnicians the inclination towards commercial pursuits, and the accumulation of great riches in the principal families, must have hindered the development of monarchy, as we find it among the Hamites in general. In this respect we may compare the Republic of Venice, or even England.

**Absolute  
Monarchy  
Hamitic.**

On the other hand, we find in the rest of the leading states of the Hamites an absolute monarchy in Egypt as in Assyria and in Babylon. With this despotism, however, is connected at the same time a striving after universal dominion; and we must characterise this vast domination, as it passed over from the Assyrians and Babylonians to the Persians, then to the Greeks, and finally to the Romans, in its origin and also (as we shall afterwards prove) in its essence, as distinctly Hamitic. How ancient the Hamitic sovereignty is we may conclude from the statement in Genesis,<sup>2</sup> which places its beginning under Nimrod at Babel; so that the rise of the great city seems also to have been contemporary with the formation of the kingdom. We have already mentioned above that the united Egyptian empire goes back to a period of between three and four thousand years before Christ. Royalty is not of ancient Semitic growth. On the contrary, when the children of Israel demand a king from Samuel, the Prophet and Judge, they know that they are thereby introducing among themselves an institution of the surrounding nations, that is, the Hamites. Samuel reminds them of the heavy burden of Hamitic royalty, and this innovation is represented as a direct falling away from God.<sup>3</sup>

It is well-known that royalty did not anciently exist among

<sup>1</sup> "Politica," II. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Genesis x., 10.

<sup>3</sup> Samuel viii.

the Arabs, and that the genuine Arabs have preserved to this day their old form of tribal government. Consequently, wherever, as in Sheba, great kingdoms arose in Arabia, there was either a Hamitic aboriginal population, or an imitation of Hamitic political institutions took place, as it did among the Hebrews. Further, it is particularly to be observed what Herodotus relates regarding the origin of royalty among the Medes, an Indo-European nation. After they had shaken off the supremacy of the Assyrians, they lived, according to their old tribal constitution, without a capital city. Afterwards, misfortunes similar to those of the Hebrews induced them to choose for themselves a king. This first king, Dêtiôcês, immediately takes the institutions of the Assyrians or the Babylonians as his model, and builds a capital, Ecbatana, the *seven* walls of which, by their number and the seven planetary colours of their ramparts, clearly betray their Babylonian style. Finally, he introduced the custom that no one should approach the king or see him, that everything should be done through messengers and go betweens.<sup>1</sup> This, again, is but an imitation of the Hamitic court etiquette, by which the king, as if he were a higher being, is withdrawn from the sight of his subjects.

Hamites in  
India and  
caste.

Another originally Hamitic institution seems to have been the division into castes. We find it in Egypt, in Sheba,<sup>2</sup> in Babylonia; the Âryan Hindûs probably borrowed caste, like many other things, from a Hamitic civilisation which they found in Hindûstân. In the peculiar development which this institution, attended by such important consequences, afterwards gained from the Âryans, it has, as is well-known, maintained itself with a wonderful tenacity even up to our own times, and seems only now to be crumbling into ruins. It is true of caste as of other political institutions that they are forms, the importance and the results of which are essentially qualified and determined by their spiritual import. One may talk of "an enlightened despotism," and praise its beneficial results. In the following chapter we

<sup>1</sup> Herod., I. 96, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Two Pariah castes—or, according to some, four—still exist in the extreme south of Arabia, in spite of the levelling influence of Islâm.

shall speak of the religious and moral import which we find in the forms of Hamitic civilisation. Yet we can already anticipate here the terrible increase of oppression which Hamitic despotism exercised by means of caste. On the whole, one cannot mistake the essential affinity of these two institutions. If the king and his subjects are separated from one another by a distinction similar to that which exists between God and man, then the subjects themselves also may be separated from one another by insurmountable barriers, and in both cases a Divine necessity may be appealed to.

**Hamitic**  
**Royalty divine.** However, let us return to the subject of Hamitic royalty, which can be understood only by considering the religious premises on which it is built. The king appears as a divinity, and is honoured as such. This is well-known with regard to the Pharaohs of Egypt; but it is also true of the Babylonian monarchs. In this connection the account given in the book of Daniel<sup>1</sup> is very remarkable. According to this narrative, the Babylonian dignitaries compel the Âryan king, who, after the downfall of the old dynasty, occupies the throne of Babylon, almost against his will to order by a decree, that during a period of thirty days no one in the whole kingdom should ask a petition of any god or man save of the king. It is evident that they make this request in order to represent the new king as equal to the old, and firmly to establish his divine dignity. Now if the king be raised to the height of a divinity, then the claim to absolute dominion, as well without as within his kingdom, is a natural one, or the demand for universal authority is united to despotism. For the divine king there cannot exist, either in this relation or in that, any real limits.

**Influence of**  
**Hamitism.** We have now approached that phenomenon in historical civilisation which has exercised by far the most mighty influence over the development of mankind. It is a fact that, at least in the province of ancient history, the great empires of the world have been the great central points of this development. Their origin, as well as

<sup>1</sup> Daniel vi.

their true nature, can, however, be perceived only among the Hamites, even although they continue to exist in the domain of Japheth also through the Persians, Greeks and Romans, and in the domain of Shem through Islâm. Thus mankind received, from Ham not only the broad foundations of civilisation in agriculture, industries, and the elements of all science and art, but also the apex of the pyramid, that is to say world-ruling kingship. Now, in order to be able to understand more thoroughly this last fact, we must devote our attention to the soul of Hamitic culture, namely, Religion and Morality.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE RELIGION OF THE HAMITIC NATIONS.

AS we have spoken of a general civilisation of the Hamitic nations, so we may now speak of a religion common to these peoples. However manifold may be the traits which Egypt or Babylon, Assyria or Phœnicia, present for the Hamitic Religion. description which we now undertake, we shall be unable to divest ourselves of the impression that we have before us in the religions of these nations branches of one stem.

But we must confess at the outset how insufficient are the labours hitherto undertaken in this special province. We are still obliged to refer in great measure to the accounts given by nations of another stock, especially to those of the Greeks and Romans, or of the Semites. Though for some time we have been receiving, comparatively speaking, abundant supplies of information from the indigenous sources of Egypt, and more recently from Assyria, yet the results of our investigations with regard to this matter must still be termed unimportant in the department of religion and mythology, and such they must necessarily be from the nature of the case. In particular, we still lack an insight into the separate stages in the development of these religions, and, consequently, the solution of many contradictions. Yet we believe that we are in a position to penetrate into the nature of the Hamitic religions by means of the method of comparison; so far as the latter, on the one hand increases the material for investigation at our disposal, and, on the other, prevents us from imagining that we have found the object of our search in accidental local forms.



We shall now, in the first place, give the leading characteristics of these religions separately, so as finally to exhibit their common nature. We shall begin with *Egypt*. It will be easily understood that, like other institutions of this land and people, so also their religion assumed a very peculiar form, owing to the fact that this portion of the Hamitic family underwent its long development in great seclusion, amidst the deserts which surround their country. However, if Mizraim, as Egypt is called in the Old Testament, a son of Ham introduced the Hamitic type of religion into the land of the Nile, we shall be able to recognise it even in its most peculiar development.

Religion of Egypt. Herodotus<sup>1</sup> expressly declares that the Egyptians, as a nation, worshipped only two deities, Osiris and Isis, while a great number of gods and goddesses had their cult at various places. It is to Isis and Osiris, that the only well-developed myth which is recorded in the whole province of the Egyptian religion, relates. From these two facts we may conclude that the religious feeling of the Egyptians gave expression to its essential and general character in the worship of these two divinities, and in the form described in that myth. On the other hand, it will appear that the rest of the deities are to be considered as more or less local modifications of that idea. Now, the Osiris myth, in its leading features, as Plutarch has related it to us in what is evidently a late form, runs as follows<sup>2</sup>:—From the clandestine marriage of Cronos and Rhea descended Osiris, Iris, and Typhôn, who were born at the same time, the last-mentioned being the destructive principle. Thereupon Osiris, the lord of all things, assumed the government for the benefit of Egypt, and introduced the cultivation of the soil, taught men to grow the produce of the field, and gave them laws. Then he went far away, in order to bless the whole world with like benefits; not to subdue it by force of arms, but by means of music and song, like the Dionysos of the Greeks. On his return, Typhôn, with seventy-two conspirators, killed him,

<sup>1</sup> Herod. II., 42.

<sup>2</sup> Plutarch, "De Isi et Osiride."



and let the corpse in its coffin be carried down the Nile into the Mediterranean. Isis, weeping, sought her beloved, and finally found the coffin at Byblos, on the Phœnician coast, under the shelter of an evergreen tamarisk. After Typhôn had once more wreaked his vengeance on the corpse, the evil deity was defeated by the warriors of Osiris, under the leadership of Horos, son of Osiris and Isis; and in Horos again arose the benign power of Osiris, while Osiris himself received sovereign sway in the realms of the dead.

Osiris and  
the Nile.

Osiris is the god who brings blessings to the valley of the Nile, whether we identify him with the overflowing of the river, or with the sun, the cause of the overflow. It is not only the produce of the ground, however, which is the gift of the river, but rather the whole civilisation of Egypt, which extended far beyond the limits of the Nile valley. Isis is the receptive, fruitful soil of Egypt, which stretches just as far as does the fertilising power of the river. After the fruitful season, the drought comes on in Egypt and lasts about seventy-two days; then the cultivated land is despoiled of its blessing by the scorching south-wind; the Nile empties itself into the desolate sea, as it were without power or life, until, finally, in the coming year, the sirocco comes to an end, and the Nile regains its benign power. If the fable represents the body of Osiris as landing on the Phœnician coast, we must regard this feature as an addition made by the Egyptian priests, who wished to show that a quite similar story of the death and resurrection of Adonis had found its way into the religion of the Phœnicians.

Now, as far as the myth is concerned, we must own that not only its rich and somewhat poetical embellishment in Plutarch belongs to a later time, but also that the myth itself is not to be regarded as the earliest expression of the Egyptian, or of the Hamitic religion. We must treat it as the full and perfect development of the genius of the Egyptian religion, just as the general extension of the worship of Osiris, and its manifold relations to Egyptian life, prove that the Egyptians found in it the satisfaction of their religious needs. Let us glance at its chief characteristics.

One of the most important of these is *duality of sex*. This shows itself to be imprinted upon our myth to the utmost extent; for to Osiris and Isis, the brother and sister deities, there is attributed a loving union even in the womb. But this dualism extends throughout the Egyptian Pantheon. Corresponding to the old gods of Lower Egypt, as, for instance, *Ptah*, whom the Greeks called *Hêphæstos*, the God of Memphis, and the Sun-god *Ra* of *Héliopolis*, there are goddesses like *Neith*, of Sais, or *Pacht* of *Bûbastis*. In Upper Egypt, *Mut* (that is, *mother*) was placed beside *Ammôn*, the god of Thebes. All these goddesses represent the conceiving and reproductive principle of Nature, as, for instance, *Neith* is called "the mother of the gods," or "the cow that bore the sun." The difference in significance between *Isis* and these goddesses lies in the more general or more particular, the more abstract or more concrete, conception of that principle. While *Isis* is the fruit-bearing soil of Egypt, *Neith* appears as the night which receives and reproduces the light. In *Hathor*, who is associated with *Horos*, the Greeks immediately recognised their *Aphroditê*. The animal sacred to her as well as to *Isis* is the cow, as fruitful and nourishing.

A similar relation, corresponding in every respect, exists between *Osiris* and the above-named gods. To the Egyptians the light rightly appeared as the life-producing and fruit-giving power of Nature. Now this may be viewed in the shining solar disk, which was their god *Ra*, or it might be conceived of as the presupposed primitive light or fire beyond the sun and the individual heavenly bodies. This the inhabitants of Lower Egypt recognised in *Ptah*, the creative and organising principle of the universe; the inhabitants of Thebes in *Ammôn*<sup>1</sup> "the concealed." How one and the same natural phenomenon, according to the aspect in which it is viewed, gives rise to a multiplicity of divine beings, is clearly evident from the relation of *Ra* to the two Gods of Upper Egypt, *Mentu* and *Atmu*, which represent the rising and the setting sun of the upper and of the nether world.

---

<sup>1</sup> In Egyptian, *Amûn*.—W. S. C. T.

Osiris the Sun-god. In fine, Osiris is nothing else than the Sun-god. Lepsius remarks, "Now Osiris is identified with Ra (that is the Sun-god)." The passages in which it is asserted by Greek and Roman writers that Osiris was originally the sun, have already been collected by Jablonski. It is, however, important to remark that the statement placed by Diodorus at the commencement of his mythological observations, to the effect that the Egyptians originally worshipped only two gods, Hêlios and Selênê (that is, the sun and moon), the former in Osiris, the latter in Isis, is, without doubt, taken from a mythological writing of Manetho. This myth shows us the Sun-god only in his earthly operation, especially as affecting the valley of the Nile, in his human form, particularly as assimilated to Egyptian life; and in a similar way Isis, the goddess of the moon, has descended and become the fruitful soil of Egypt, just as Osiris also may be perceived in the Nile, in the working and manifestation of the Sun-god, the bestower of blessings and creator of fruits. That such and other modifications of the nature of their divinities should have been introduced in the course of so long and vast a civilisation may readily be understood. Meanwhile, Herodotus<sup>1</sup> informs us that the Libyans dwelling in the west of Egypt, who were another Hamitic tribe that had remained in a nomadic condition, honoured only two deities, namely, the sun and the moon.

There is, then, no doubt that duality of sex forms part of the fundamental conception of the divine in the Egyptian religion. The importance of this principle is confirmed by the statement of Diodorus regarding the adoration of the he-goat and of Priapus among the Egyptians. "This deity it is, into whose mysteries the priests are first initiated on their entrance upon the office of their fathers." To these mysteries of divine sexual life belonged, on the other hand, the very strange idea, which was not peculiar to the Egyptians only, but is found in other Hamitic religions also, that the male deity is at the same time both son and husband of the divine primæval mother; the monstrous idea of divine incest. This is what

<sup>1</sup> Herod IV., 188.

is implied in the famous inscription of the goddess Neith at Sais, "I am what is and what will be; no one has lifted my veil; the fruit which I have borne has become the sun." This is the cow which bore the sun, the male deity; it is the primæval cause of things conceived of as feminine, the *hylê*, or the chaos, out of which God first issues to produce living beings.<sup>1</sup>

In the next place it remains for us to inquire what is signified by Typhôn, and in what relation he stands to the rest of the divinities. In this divine being quite a different kind of dualism seems to present itself. But here we must carefully avoid thinking of the dualism of the Zoroastrian religion, or even of the opposition between God and devil. Typhôn, it is true, gradually assumes a moral significance also, since all that opposes order is ascribed to him; but originally he is only the reverse of generative and productive nature; he is corruption and destruction, in particular he is the glowing sun and the burning wind which destroy vegetation, but he is also the unfruitful sea which swallows up the fruitful Nile. How little we must conceive of an absolute and independent opposition between Typhôn on the one hand, and Osiris and Isis on the other, is plainly shown by the statement in the myth that Typhôn belonged to the same womb as those deities. Thus the sun which causes the Nile to rise, necessarily passes over into the heat which destroys life. Only gradually did the destructive and deadly principle, which was originally considered as connected with the generative, (as indeed in Nature it is connected) appear to the Egyptians to be divided into persons separated and opposed to each other. This assertion, however, will be more clearly proved by explaining the conception of Moloch, which corresponds to that of Typhôn in the kindred Hamitic religions.

This leads us to a second characteristic of our  
 Birth, suffering,  
 and death of  
 the Deity. myth, namely, the *birth, suffering and death of the deity*. If the divine be once manifested in the life of Nature, it is only a natural consequence that the beginning

<sup>1</sup> Döllinger, "Heathendom and Judaism."

and end of Nature-life should also be ascribed to the divinity. The deity is the ever new life of Nature, which never attains to a new manifestation of itself except through a constantly recurring death. Now, the Egyptian religion did not ascribe birth and death to all the gods without distinction; for the power of Nature is conceived of rather as their concealed original source. Yet, as far as this power manifests itself, and thus comes into direct contact with Man, it participates in birth and death; and it is this peculiarity which has brought the Divine so near to Man. On this account the worship of Osiris was the most wide-spread in the country. Almost all the mysteries which under various names were solemnised in Egypt, were connected with the birth, and finally with the death, of Osiris. In this doctrine many things necessarily presented themselves which had to be concealed from the profane eyes of the multitude.

If, now, the Egyptians did not shrink from allowing the deity as the ever-giving power of life in Nature, to participate in birth and death, we shall also be able in some measure to understand how they believed that they could recognise the same in the most prominent manifestations of animal life. It is well known that in Egypt a number of species of animals were regarded as leading representatives of the deity, and in certain individuals of those species received divine honours. "When one came," as Clement of Alexandria relates, "through the most magnificent temple halls into the innermost sanctuary, and the priest raised the gold-embroidered curtain, one saw a cat, a crocodile, or even a serpent, rolling on purple coverlets."

Among quadrupeds the bull and the cow, the he-goat, the dog and the cat, a kind of ape, and the shrew-mouse; among birds, the ibis and the sparrow-hawk; even snakes and crocodiles, and a beetle, the scarabaeus, were to be found among the objects of their worship. Although the Osiris-myth had assumed a human development, (and therefore the image of Osiris was fashioned in a purely human form) that did not prevent the Egyptians from seeing an incarnation of the God in the bull Apis, as in the cow that of Isis. As regards Apis,

it was believed that a sunbeam had impregnated the cow which bore him, or that the soul of Osiris migrated from one Apis into another. In these animals it was their fruitfulness and their utility in agriculture, the gift of Osiris, that was adored. The he-goat was regarded as representing the generative power of Nature. In the cat, the animal which sees in the dark, was recognised the light breaking forth from the darkness. In the crocodile was manifested the destructive side of Nature, which also received divine honours in Typhón.

**Deification of Nature-life.** We must not think of the sacred, or rather the divine animals of the Egyptians, apart from animal life in general, as incarnations of the deity, nor again of animal life apart from the universal life of Nature. It is the same divine power of Nature which permeates all life, vegetable and animal as well as human; the light of the sun has likewise produced this life and manifested itself therein.

Consequently, the bent of the Egyptian religion should have led them to ascribe divine honours to Man, inasmuch as Man is the most powerful and excellent incarnation of the power of Nature. Yet it is well known that the worship of animals predominated among the Egyptians. We see that this tendency must to some degree stop short at man, since the very nature of religion demands that his adoration should not be directed to himself, but that he should have as an object of veneration and worship something without and above himself, and not something within himself. Thus, the Egyptians believed that the mystery of Nature and of divine life might be comprehended in *animals*; probably also because it appeared to them to be more enigmatical and more important in animals than in man or in plants.

**Worship of the Pharaohs.** Yet we must not overlook the fact that the deification of humanity found its perfect realisation at least in one sphere, that is, the worship of the rulers of the land, the Pharaohs. In them humanity appeared to pass the limits of the individual, and to confront the rest of men as a divine power, whether salutary or baneful. This absolutely divine worship of the rulers descended from the most ancient



times to the subjugation of Egypt by the Greeks and Romans.<sup>1</sup> As in the beginning the gods ruled over Egypt, so, later, did the Pharaohs, not merely because they claimed to be their descendants, but rather as being actual gods. The king was called, and was believed to be, the mighty Horos—the god of blessing to the country; and the queen was regarded as the mother of the land—as the mistress of the world, being identified with Isis, Neith, or Hathor. According to the inscription on the Rosetta stone, however, the image of “the God Epiphanés” was to be worshipped three times a day in every temple, and on high festivals honours similar to those due to the other gods must be paid to him; and besides this a yearly feast, lasting five days, was ordered to be celebrated by a priesthood of his own.

Finally, the most striking evidence of the deification of the Pharaohs is afforded by the tombs of the kings, that is to say the Pyramids. In the execution of such mountainous works the Pharaohs sought to vie with the Deity, and the immense expenditure of men, time and material becomes intelligible only if we call to mind, not merely the despotism of the rulers, but also their adoration as gods on the part of the people. In fine, it has been justly remarked that, even when erecting temples to the gods, the kings thought more of themselves than of the gods, so much so that the sculptures on the temples narrate and perpetuate, not the doings of the gods, but those of the kings. According to the religious views of the Egyptians, however, it was quite natural that the visible deity should eclipse the invisible, just as the gigantic tombs, known as the Pyramids, towered above the temples of the gods.

**Egyptian ideas of the next life.** This leads us to consider the notions of the Egyptians with regard to the next life. According to Herodotus,<sup>2</sup> the Egyptians were the first who affirmed that the human soul is immortal. It is evident, therefore,

---

<sup>1</sup> The deification of men by the Egyptians and Babylonians was followed by the worship of the dead, and especially of the kings, among the ancient Sabæans. This is proved by the recent investigation of inscriptions in the Himyaritic language.

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus II., 123.

that among this wonderful people the greatest elevation of thought existed, together with, and in striking contrast to, ideas utterly repugnant to our notions. While holding to their doctrine of the deification of animals, they believed firmly in the certainty of the immortality of the soul. The belief in a future life, in a judgment after death, and in future rewards and punishments, was held most firmly by the Egyptians. These doctrines gradually underwent a detailed theological development, similar to that undergone by the Christian belief in the other world during the Middle Ages. In particular, the punishments in the Egyptian hell not unfrequently remind us of Dante's "Inferno." Very different, indeed, were their conceptions of future bliss. The Egyptian could not conceive of Paradise otherwise than as a continuation—perhaps an idealisation—of Egyptian life, with its Nile and its fields, its toils and its pleasures. "The dead man sails on the celestial waters, he ploughs, sows, reaps, threshes, in the Heavenly fields, which are surrounded by water." The Greeks, perhaps, formed their conceptions of the Elysian fields and the Isles of the Blessed from these Egyptian accounts.

But the repulsive aberration of religion which appears in the deification of the Pharaohs, and in the still more objectionable deification of animals, is most intimately connected with the Egyptian belief in immortality. The bond which unites these ideas, and which, at the same time, brings them within our comprehension, is the doctrine of the *transmigration of souls*. Herodotus is right in directly associating this doctrine with the Egyptian belief in immortality. Moreover, this dogma was probably more minutely dealt with in connection with the service of Osiris, especially in the Mysteries; hence Herodotus speaks of it only very briefly and ambiguously. The doctrine of the transmigration of souls expresses the fundamental idea of the Egyptian religion. That is the notion that the life of the Godhead and of Nature is only one and the same, and that this manifests itself in the gods, in the stars, and in all grades

<sup>1</sup> Lepsius, "Das Todtenbuch der Ägypter," p. 12.



of life on earth—in the plant, the animal, and man. This life, since it not only issues forth from God but is itself divine, must, according to its nature, strive to return to its source in the Deity. Passing through various animals, marine and terrestrial, as well as through birds, the soul at last attains to a human body, so that finally, after a good life, it may become one with Osiris in the next world. On this account the Egyptians naturally shrank from killing animals, and especially certain species of them.<sup>1</sup> But the scale of being, in its progress from the lower to the higher animals and to man, was in no way thought to run in an unbroken line. On the contrary, the bull Apis, like other sacred animals, was the incarnation of a God, and therefore stood in the same relation to the lower animals that Pharaoh did to his poor, oppressed subjects. Thus we must assume that among animals, as well as among men, definite ranks were thought to exist, from which there took place a transition into the eternal and divine life. On the other hand, it is probable that it was supposed that the wicked and unclean soul must pass through unclean animals, or despised classes of men, before it could gain the purity necessary for passing into the blessed and divine life.

Judgment of  
the dead. Max Dunker says: "This seems to be indicated by representations of the judgment of the dead, in which a soul changed into a sow—the personification of the sin of gluttony—is scourged away from the Judgment-Hall of the Dead." To the things necessary for reception into the bliss of Osiris belonged, lastly, the perfect preservation of the last corporeal covering of the soul. This was effected, as is well known, by means of embalming. Perhaps, at the bottom of this lay the belief that if the substance of the body were dragged back into the revolving course of Nature, then the soul also would again have to enter upon its wanderings. In the blessed hereafter, however, the dead man attains to the

---

<sup>1</sup> If, however, human and animal souls are of the same nature, we understand how there arose the fables which characterise Hamitic civilisation, and in which animals are introduced as speaking. About this we have spoken in the previous chapter.

vision of light, of Osiris, nay he himself becomes Osiris. "Thy heart," it is said of the blessed dead, "is now the heart of Ra; thy members are the members of the great Horos; thy divine soul is in heaven, to accomplish every transformation which thou wishest."<sup>1</sup> Thus we see that the Egyptian doctrine of immortality is only a consequence of their doctrine of the transmigration of the soul, or even of their deification of men. For if all souls are originally divine beings, they will live for ever after the completion of their wanderings, after stripping off everything that is not divine.

Comparison and contrast with Christian doctrine. In this connexion we have already given a few intimations calculated to moderate the surprise which the striking points of contact between these doctrines and those of Christianity might cause, especially among superficial observers. Here, if anywhere, the maxim holds good: "If two say the same, it is not the same." At any rate, the Egyptian religion teaches the divine origin of human nature somewhat as Christianity does, and consequently indicates also its *one* aim, that is to say, eternal life; but in how very different a sense! The deity is, according to the Egyptian view, not the holy and eternal Being exalted above Nature and Nature-life, but rather is regarded as the soul of Nature and the world, diffused in all living things, and thus passes through birth, generation, and death. Thus, while humanity is deified and made partaker of an eternal divine life, this is done at the cost of degrading the divine to the brutish. However, such a false exaltation and glorification of the creature as takes from GOD what is GOD's, must reveal its falsehood by its own peculiar fruits. In spite of this religious theory, men as they really are, especially the lower orders, gave to themselves, as well as to others, so little the impression of being divine that they did not dare to attribute to themselves this character, but were content to behold it in Pharaoh as their representative.

In contrast to human woe, in contrast to the thousand-voiced cries of human suffering, the mute peace and the mysterious

<sup>1</sup> Brugsch, quoted by Döllinger.

harmony of animal life appeared to them to be so much more divine that they found it easier to conceive of the deity as embodied in it. And thus, while numerous animal gods were tended by priests in magnificent temples, it was possible for hundreds of thousands of human beings to perish miserably in the construction of the pyramids or of canals. For, as the worship of the deity in certain chosen species or individual animals did not exclude the detestation of the unclean species, so also the apotheosis of the human in Pharaoh, or even in the noble Egyptian families who, in life and in death, performed all their religious duties, had still less the effect of hindering the utmost contempt for the lowest classes of Egyptian humanity, to say nothing of non-Egyptian nations.

Comparison  
with Indian  
Pantheism  
and caste.

In the very closely-related religious views prevalent in Brāhmanical India we see very similar consequences. The Pantheistic doctrine of the Brāhmans with regard to the divinity of all creature life is, indeed, advantageous to animals, and especially to the deified Brāhmans, but not so to the lower castes; still less to outcasts. It appears as if the religious error of declaring all creature life to be divine brought with it the division into castes, which has proved so terrible in its social consequences. For we find caste nowhere so pronounced as in Egypt and in India, though it appears to have been less oppressive in the former country than in the latter, probably in consequence of the counterpoise afforded by the despotism of the Pharaohs. As Pantheism asserts the essential similarity of all creature life, so the division into castes opposes to this the differences which exist in human life, on the ground of their reality and of human pride. And this is done, not only with remarkable indifference to human feelings, but even with cruelty. In this respect the deification of humanity may be compared with absolute Free Trade, when religious and moral forces do not intervene, but when the selfishness of the natural man asserts itself without restraint. As capital is apt to take advantage of Free Trade in order to enslave the masses who work in manufactories, so, in the deification of humanity, the Pharaoh alone, or the upper castes, claim the rank of deities in

order to deprive the masses, not only of their divinity, but even of their humanity. And in the doctrine of the transmigration of souls there was most probably found for the Egyptian priests, as also for the Brâhmans, the justification of such claims. The miserable and afflicted classes of men were in both cases considered as guilty beings subjected to penance and purification.

### *BABYLON AND NINEVEH.*

Let us now pass from the land of the Nile to that of the *Two Rivers*, from Memphis and Thebes to *Babylon* and *Nineveh*. We have here to do with the capitals of two kingdoms and nations, which, indeed, were often opposed to each other in fierce contest. Yet their civilisation, like their religion, was essentially the same, although distinct shades of difference must not be ignored. While in Egypt, with the exception of the inroad of the Hyksôs, and, perhaps, a few similar ones, the people kept themselves almost unmixed (except, perhaps, for slight accessions from the kindred Ethiopians) even up to the time of the Persians and the Greeks; in Mesopotamia, on the other hand, which was exposed on several sides, an intermixture of nations was continually taking place, even from the most ancient times. But the old religion, supported as it was by a magnificent civilisation, seems to have maintained itself in Babylon wholly unaltered. In Nineveh also it underwent only slight changes, of which we shall speak later. Even the Persian conquest, in spite of the great contrast between the two religions which were thus brought into comparison with one another, was unable to injure the superior forces of Babylonian civilisation. A stronger influence was first brought to bear upon it by the Greeks. It was probably in the presentiment that ancient Babylon was approaching its end that Bêrôsus, a priest of the temple of Bêl, at Babylon, in the third century before Christ, drew up in the Greek language a compilation of the most important facts of Chaldean antiquity, and sought to preserve them to posterity. At the same time the Egyptian priest, Manetho, undertook a similar task for his own country. Of

the writings of both of these important fragments have been preserved to us.

The Chaldean priest did not, however, undertake to inform us concerning the religion of his people, but rather regarding their history. But since, in the cosmogony which he has preserved for us, he commences with the beginning of all things, he at the same time starts, in my opinion, with the idea which underlies the whole of the religion of Babylonia. "There was a time," as we are told by Bêrôsus, "when the universe consisted of darkness and water. Therein lived all sorts of monsters,—men with two or four wings and double faces, with one body and two heads, man and woman in one; others with goat's feet and horns; hippocentaurs, bulls with human heads, and other animals with heterogenous members, like some figures which are still preserved in the temple of Bêl. Over this kingdom ruled a woman named Omoroca, that is in Chaldaean, Thawath, which means *sea* and also *moon*. Now Bêl, whom the Greeks call Zeus, came against it, cut the woman in two, and made of one half the earth, and of the other the heaven. At last, however, Bêl allowed one of the other gods to cut off his head, to mix earth with his blood, and to form men as well as animals. Now, whilst these living beings rejoiced in the heavenly lights which Bêl has formed as stars, sun, moon, and the five planets, those monsters, not being able to bear the light, vanished away."

However strange these things may at first sight appear, the analogy between the Babylonian and other closely connected religions, and, finally, the more recent examination of the cuneiform inscriptions, allow us to perceive the fundamental ideas which they represented. One of the most important characters we meet with is the woman who rules over chaos, darkness, and water. The primæval ocean, the dark, mysterious abyss, is itself conceived of as a female deity; therefore the Chaldean name, Thawath, is simply translated *sea* by Bêrôsus; otherwise, how could heaven and earth afterwards have risen from it? If the woman is also called the moon (perhaps through a later addition), it is

Babylonian  
Cosmogony.

Meaning of  
the myth.

only that another principle of similar import is about to be stated, just as Isis also is goddess of the moon, in accordance with the notion that Selênê is the female deity corresponding to the Sun-god. Through the deciphering of the cuneiform inscriptions, however, we are enabled to explain aright the name "Omoróca," which has hitherto been entirely misunderstood. This word is nothing but one of the numberless names of the chief goddess of the Babylonians, who is called Mylitta by Herodotus, that is, Belit, the female deity corresponding to Bêl. In the cuneiform inscriptions she is called "Um-Uruk," and also "Belit-Uruk," that is, *mother or mistress of Uruk*, one of the chief seats of her worship, the Erech of the Bible,<sup>1</sup> or the Orchoë of the Greek geographers.<sup>2</sup> Now, as mother of Uruk, the Babylonian goddess appears in her gloomier aspect, representing the dark, primæval source of all life, the reverse and yet the same as the bright, radiant figure of the sea-born Aphroditê.

Corresponding to this woman appears Bêl, the chief god, and originally, like Osiris-Ra among the Egyptians, the only male deity of the Babylonians. He is the god of life and light, yet only in sexual union with the conceiving principle of Nature. Such a union as this again is veiled in that god's act of violence towards the primitive woman, by an interchange of ideas which not seldom occurs in antiquity; and thereby is produced what we call the creation—from chaos, which by itself can produce only monstrous forms, yet out of which heaven and earth are produced. Nevertheless, the world of living beings cannot come into existence without an act of violence, which here costs the god his life, as the former cost that of the woman. It is only from the blood of Bêl, which the earth has drunk, that men and animals can spring. Here also we must apparently think not only of the death of Bêl, but also of an act of generation; just as in Hesiod's Theogony it is related

<sup>1</sup> Genesis x., 10.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. H. Rawlinson in G. Rawlinson's Herodotus, Vol. I. ;\* and Fr. Lenormant, "Essai de commentaire des fragments cosmogoniques de Bérosee d'après les textes cunéiformes et les monuments de l'art asiatique" (Paris, 1871), p. 85.



that Aphrodité sprang from the fructifying blood of Ouranés which was mingled with the sea.

Yet one may inquire, If originally, as Bêrôsus says, the universe was darkness and water, and if this primitive ocean and primitive night itself was the woman, whence

*Leading idea.* then comes the god Bêl? As among the Egyptians night is the mother of light, so also among the Babylonians, in harmony with the universal Hamitic notion, the answer will be that Bêl is himself the son of that primitive woman; and thus arises the abominable idea, so characteristic of Hamitism, that all creature-life has proceeded from an act of incest. We recognise this characteristic again in the Assyrian myth of the incestuous marriage of Semiramis and her son Ninyas, and the tragical intercourse between Œdipús and Iôcastê. The Phœnician, and consequently the Hamitic, origin of the latter myth will be mentioned later.

Thus we find, according to the religious views of the Babylonians, sexual dualism as well as death rooted in the nature of the deity. We have already discovered that the birth of the divinity does not contradict this, and we must conclude the same from the fact of his dying. For if the god dies, he must also be continually being re-born.

Let us now add the information which Herodotus affords us regarding the religion of the people, as gathered from his own visit to Babylon.<sup>1</sup> He found there the sanctuary of Bêl, with its eight towers built one above another. And in the last and highest tower was the temple, but there was no image in it, but only a beautifully prepared bed and a golden table. From time to time, however, a native woman, selected by the god himself, spent the night there; and the woman was supposed to receive visits from the god. The same was reported of an Egyptian woman in the temple of Jupiter-Ammon, in Thebes. So the priests of both these temples stated to Herodotus.

Still more repulsive, however, is the corresponding feature in the worship of Mylitta, which is likewise related to us by Herodotus.<sup>2</sup> That is, the consecrated prostitution to which

<sup>1</sup> Herod. I. 181, *sq.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, I., 199.

every Babylonian woman once in her life had to submit in honour of this Babylonian Aphroditê. The women devoted to the goddess sat in the holy grove with a fillet of cords around their heads. The money which they received in the name of Mylitta belonged to the temple. Herodotus does not forget to remark that a similar practice prevailed in several places in Cyprus; that is, in districts belonging to the Phœnicians. We have, in fact, to deal with a custom which extended over the whole domain of Hamitism; traces of it are found in Egypt also.<sup>1</sup>

The seemingly very contrary characteristic—the <sup>Death connected with the Deity.</sup> dying of the Deity—manifests itself also not less clearly in the worship of the Babylonians and of kindred nations. According to the most reliable ancient testimony, as well as in accordance with more recent cuneiform researches, the tomb of Bêl existed in the pyramid of Babylon.<sup>2</sup> According to Herodotus also, there was in the temple described above a lower sanctuary, with a golden image of Bêl, and with a sacrificial service. Finally, Layard has discovered at Nimrûd, in the centre of the vast storeyed tower, a large sepulchral chamber, which appears to have corresponded to the resting-place of Bêl in the pyramid of Babylon.<sup>3</sup>

It is very remarkable that the oldest pyramid in Egypt, that of Sakhara, resembles most closely the Babylonian sanctuary of Bêl, both in its architecture and in its purpose. This pyramid, like those of Mesopotamia, is built of bricks, and in storeys, and was not a royal tomb like the rest, but contained the Apis mummies of the Old Empire. Now, while the lower part of the edifice was dedicated to the worship of the dead, the exterior of the Egyptian pyramids apparently served for that of the Sun, as may be inferred from their perfect orientation. In the later pyramids the kings, as sons of the Sun, rested. It is certain that the Mesopotamian towers of the gods had the grave in their lower part.

<sup>1</sup> Herod., II., 126, 134.

<sup>2</sup> Strabo 16. Ctesias (Persic. 21. Aelian. Var. Hist. xiv., 3)\* Cf. Fr. Lenormant, p. 364.

<sup>3</sup> "Nineveh and Babylon," p. 128.



their upper portion there was the chapel of the *living* deity, namely, that of the Sun-god. From this upper portion the priests observed the movements of the stars, especially those of the planets. To the sevenfold number of these answered the number and the colour of the storeys, while the base, as an eighth storey, was dedicated to the heaven of the fixed stars and its mysterious depths, which encompassed the planets. Accordingly, it appears that the pyramids of the Egyptians and those of the Mesopotamians, which were originally similar to each other, developed among the former into sepulchral sanctuaries, among the latter into temples.

Therefore, according to the Egyptian as well as to the Babylonian view, the deity is ever passing from life to death, and returning from death to life, just as the sun and the other luminaries of heaven are always setting and again rising.

**Mesopotamian Pantheon.** Let us now glance at the principal figures of the Mesopotamian pantheon, as far as it is possible to do so in the present state of our knowledge of Babylonian and Assyrian mythology.<sup>1</sup> Besides Bél appears Anu, the Anammelech (Anu Malik, i.e., King Anu) of Scripture.<sup>2</sup> He is called "the Ancient One," "the Father of the gods," "the Lord of the spirits above the earth and under the earth." His name *Anu* (or in Accadian, *An-na*) means *Heaven*, like the *Ouranos* of the Greeks. The third of the great gods worshipped by the Babylonians was Ea or Hea. He is called "the King," "the Creator of the Universe," and "the Decreeer of Fate." As god of the sea and of the waters under the earth, and, in short, of all that is below and within the earth, he bears also the names of "King of the Deep," "Lord of Springs," "King of the Rivers." Whenever an important question arises among the Gods, Ea is always called upon for advice, as, for example, regarding the defence of the dwellings of the gods.<sup>3</sup> Ea is also spoken of as the protecting deity of voyagers.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lenormant, 59. :  
ii., 31.

<sup>3</sup> Würdter, "Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens nach den Keilschrift-denkmälern," 23.

After these three principal gods of the Babylonians appears a fourth, Nebo (Nabu) or Nusku (perhaps the Nisroch of Scripture).<sup>1</sup> He is the god of intelligence and learning. He is spoken of as the inventor of writing, and sometimes also as presiding over marriage and generation. As these four gods are more or less varying representations of one male deity, so the four goddesses who are associated with them meet in the one of whom we have already spoken. This goddess, like the Isis of the Egyptians, has many names, according to the deity with whom she is associated. Thus, as consort of Bêl (*the Lord*) she is called Belit or Beltu (*the Lady*). When regarded as the wife of Anu she is styled Anat. Ea's consort is entitled *Dam-ki-na* (Lady of the Earth) or *Nin-ki-gal* (the great Lady of the Earth). The spouse of Nebo is usually *Tasmit* ("she that hears"), but when he is regarded as god of fertility, *Istar* (the Astartê of the Asiatic Greeks and the Ashtoreth of Palestine) is his consort. Identical with Istar is Derketo-Atergatis, who, together with the fish-god Dagon, was worshipped on the Philistine coast. She had the face of a woman but the body of a fish.<sup>2</sup>

Sun, moon,  
and stars. The Babylonian ideas regarding the deity undergo a wider variation, so far as the latter is brought into relation with the stars. In this way sun, moon and planets themselves become deities without being anything else than phenomena through which the deity above referred to works. According to Diodorus the planets are the interpreters of the gods.<sup>3</sup> We may here notice that the moon is regarded as a male deity, whereas the female deity appears in the planet Venus (Istar).

Over this assembly of the gods presides a god who appears to be of an essentially different character. This is *Ilu*, who, among the Assyrians, is called Assur, and who was probably the national god of the ruling Semitic race. He was entitled, "King and Father of the gods," though he was without any corresponding female deity, indeed he appears not even to have

<sup>1</sup> 2 Kings xix., 37; Isaiah xxxvii., 36.

<sup>2</sup> Diodorus II., 4; Lucian, "De dea Syra," 14. <sup>3</sup> Diodorus II., 30.

had a temple in Chaldaea. These strange facts are, however, readily explicable if we suppose that Assur was worshipped only in Assyria, because there the Semitic element in the population was by far the most numerous; while, on the other hand, *Ilu* (or, as he was called by the indigenous Accadians, *Dingir*, that is, God<sup>1</sup>) was in Babylonia gradually superseded in the minds of the people by the inferior deities.

Lastly, we have still to speak of a Mesopotamian deity who was worshipped chiefly in Assyria, and who forms a connecting link with the Moloch-worship of the Canaanite and Phœnician tribes. This will allow us once more to glance at the fundamental characteristic of the Mesopotamian religion. That deity is the so-called Assyrian Hercules. Among the Mesopotamians he was called *Adar* (the dark) or *Ninib*. In 2 Kings xvii., 31, he is called *Adrammelech* (*Adar Malik*, "King Adar") and joined with "Anammelech." To these gods the inhabitants of the Chaldean city of Sepharvaim ("the two Sipparas," i.e., Sippara and Accad<sup>2</sup>), one of the original seats of Hamitic religion and culture, burnt their children in the fire. *Adar* is the god of the planet Saturn; he is the *Melcarth* (that is, *Melech-Qaryath*, "King of the City") of the Phœnicians, the *Moloch* (*Malik*) of the Canaanites. Among the remains of Assyrian art we see his image, when represented as a colossal figure he crushes the lion, the symbol of the destructive glowing heat. In Tarsus, the chief city of Cilicia, one of the oldest cities in the world, he was regarded as god of the Sun. But the Sun-god cannot accomplish his course without himself falling a prey to the powers of death, in order to begin his circuit afresh, purified and rejuvenated. Accordingly, the festival of the self-destruction of the god was celebrated for five days at Tarsus in honour of this Hercules-*Sandan*, by burning his image on a magnificent funeral pile. The coins of the city, of which this god, as "Baal of Tarsus" was considered the founder, show the image of the funeral pyre, with an eagle hovering over it.<sup>3</sup> The fundamental idea of this is none other

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the Turkish *tengri*.—W. S. C. T.

<sup>2</sup> Genesis x., 10.

<sup>3</sup> Lenormant, 145.

than that which underlies the purely Egyptian myth of the bird Phœnix, that is to say, the self-destruction and ever repeated self-renewal of Nature life. This is the god who, as he burnt himself, is also honoured by the destruction of what is dearest. To him, therefore, the people of Sepharvaim in Babylonia, and to him, as Moloch, the Canaanites and Phœnicians also, burnt their children.

As the Tyrian Hercules wanders through the world, making conquests and founding cities, so also does the Assyrian. In this capacity he appears among the Assyrians as Ninus, the founder of their kingdom and the builder of the city of Nineveh. According to Herodotus,<sup>1</sup> Ninus is the son of Bêl and there can be no doubt that we have in him a modification of that god. To the warlike, destructive power of Hercules there is joined, as the other side of the shield, lust and slavish devotion to women. This is seen in Hercules and Omphalê according to the fables of the Greeks. He is Ninyas the son of Ninus in the Assyrian myth; son and also husband of Semiramis. Semiramis, again, is a daughter of the fish-goddess Derkêto; that is to say, she is merely a representation of the great Mesopotamian goddess of Nature. The myth also mentions, as her first husband, one Oannês, that is, the fish-formed Oannês spoken of by Bêrosus.

Here, however, we have to complete her character by means of new details. Semiramis is, at the same time, the warlike goddess, who conquers and founds cities, like the Astartê of the Phœnicians; and, on the other hand, the insatiable courtesan, who, while she is sensuality itself, at the same time kills all her lovers. In this character Istar is represented in the Izdubar legends, where we find her paying court to Izdubar himself. He, however, rejects her advances, and taunts her with the murder of her many bridegrooms, among whom he mentions Tammuz, the young and beautiful sun-god Alala (the wild eagle), the lion-son of Silele, and Isullanu the woodsman.<sup>2</sup> According to the myth, Semiramis, from being a slave of wonderful beauty, becomes the wife of the

<sup>1</sup> Herod. I., 7.

<sup>2</sup> Sayce, "Babylonian Literature," 29.

ruler Ninus. Then she begs from her husband the sovereignty and the throne for five days, and during this time she causes him to be killed, and takes possession of the kingdom. She now becomes the slave of her passions, and causes her lovers to be buried under the Semiramis-mounds. At last, she is transformed into a dove—the bird sacred to the goddess of Nature—and disappears.

What we have hitherto tried to show, in a series of sketches (which might easily have been multiplied), with regard to the nature of the Mesopotamian religion, may Hamitic "Feast of Tabernacles." probably be best illustrated by an account of the most important religious festival of these nations. This is the so-called *Sakeen* festival, or Feast of Tabernacles, in Babylon. It was also celebrated in Nineveh and in Carthage. Then the slaves ruled over their masters. A slave was publicly exhibited, most beautifully adorned, with gold chains and rings, clad in a light red transparent robe, a bowl in one hand, and (probably as a sign of his power) a battle-axe in the other, surrounded by women and seated on the royal throne, under a purple canopy, not unlike Adonis at the Alexandrian court-feasts. In this slave, Sandan or Sardan, a wantonly blooming figure of half-female form, the people of the "mad city of Nineveh," as Phocylides, or the "well-favoured harlot Nineveh," as the prophet Nahum calls it,<sup>1</sup> had their fill of pleasure. This feast of pleasure lasted for five days. The king of the feast received a regal consort from the harem of the ruler, either a slave-girl, or, as several accounts say, a royal concubine. After the expiration of these five days, during which he enjoyed all earthly pleasures to the full, he, together with all his grandeur, was burnt. This is the genuinely Hamitic Sandan, or Sardanapalus festival, which gave rise to the well-known myth<sup>2</sup> of King Sardanapalus, of whom it is related that he, after a life of debauchery and gluttony, burnt himself alive, together with his wives and all

<sup>1</sup> Nahum iii., 4.

<sup>2</sup> The historical King Sardanapalus (Assur-bani-pal) did not die in the way related in the myth.—W. S. C. T.

his precious things, so as to escape from his enemies. The king and queen of the feast represented the god and the goddess; the people kept the festival in tabernacles, in which, besides all kinds of revelry, the "consecrated" prostitution of wives and maidens took place.

**Sardanapalus Statues.** Another expression of the same idea was found in the remarkable statues of Sardanapalus, as they were called, of which Greek writers give an account. One of them stood near Anchialê, not far from Tarsus. It was a marble figure, dressed in Lydian fashion, with both hands raised on high, and seemed to be snapping the fingers of the right hand with a gesture which indicated contempt and indifference. The statue bore an inscription in metrical form and in the Assyrian language, to the following effect: "Sardanapalus, son of Anakyndaraxês, built Anchialê and Tarsus in one day. Eat, drink, and be merry" (which latter phrase was expressed in Assyrian by a stronger term) "for the rest of man's life is not worth so much as *that*," the *that* being indicated by the gesture above mentioned. A second figure, with an inscription of similar import, existed at Nineveh, and passed as the monument of Sardanapalus, or of Ninus.

**Hamitic view of life.** We believe that we shall not err in assuming that these words, as well as these monuments, were not of a private character, but, on the contrary, being ascribed to mythological personages, were intended to represent a fundamental feature of the Assyrio-Hamitic view of life. The peculiar custom of the Egyptians, which Herodotus relates to us,<sup>1</sup> coincides, in all essential particulars, with this fundamental characteristic. At the banquets of the rich they used to hand round a small figure representing a mummy; and to say to each guest, "Look well at this, and then drink and be merry, for when thou art dead, so shalt thou be."

#### THE RELIGION OF THE PHœNICIANS.

Finally, in dealing with the religion of the *Phœnicians* we may be more brief, because we meet with notions for the most

<sup>1</sup> Herod. II., 78.



part the same as, or similar to, those which we found in Egypt or in Mesopotamia.

The chief deity of the Phœnicians and of the numerous Canaanite tribes was Baal, the same god that the Babylonians called Bêl. He is among the Phœnicians also the Sun-god, so far as he is considered as the male principle in nature, which everywhere generates life. In this universality of his, the god receives a more precise designation, through having prominence given to a special aspect of the conception, as, for instance, *Baalsamîn*, "Baal of Heaven; or through the mention of a place celebrated for his worship, as when he is called Baal of Tyre. But with the idea of this god there is always connected, as an indispensable correlative, the corresponding female deity, Baaltis or Ashêrah, as the conceiving and producing principle of Nature. The Hamites appear to have from the first attached to this word *Baal*, when taken in its religious meaning, a sexual significance, as the same word in Hebrew also signifies *husband*. Just on account of this profane, and to the Hebrew mind revolting, significance, the word could by no means be used by an Israelite as a name of God, though otherwise it might be interchanged with *Adôn* (Lord).

As, however, the Egyptian god Osiris cannot escape death, so death is not less inherent in the nature of the Phœnician deity. This essential feature appears in the god whom the Greeks called Adônîs,<sup>1</sup> because they heard him so named in the Phœnician songs of mourning, although he is none other than Baal himself. He appears in the Adônîs myth as a beautiful youth, loved by Aphroditê. While hunting, the god of the early spring is killed by a boar, which represents the burning heat of summer. The goddess seeks him weeping, till she again finds him in the green herbs which his blood has reddened. The chief scene in this story was laid near Byblus, on the Phœnician coast. In that place was situated the spot where Aphroditê had embraced her beloved for the last time ("Aphêk "

<sup>1</sup> His real name among the Syrians was Tammuz (Ezekiel viii., 14). *Adônîs* is simply *adônî* ("My Lord") with a Greek termination — W. S. C. T.

=embracing). There was the river Adônîs, which, on the anniversary of his death, grew red with his blood. The fate of Adônîs was represented in the little Adônîs gardens, in which were cultivated such plants as quickly spring up and grow luxuriantly, but which soon wither away through the burning rays of the sun. The women, whose favourite festival was that of Adônîs, sought, as Aphroditê had done, the image of Adônîs, and found it in the lettuce of the Adônîs gardens. The mourn-

ing for the deceased Adônîs was like mourning for the death of an only son, accompanied by outbursts of the most violent grief. At a later period the women in Byblus could release themselves from the obligation to cut off their hair only on condition that they should abandon themselves for money, during a whole day after the funeral feast, to strangers who had come to the festival, and should bring their earnings into the temple of Baaltis. The women used to lacerate their breasts with knives. By the bier on which lay the figure of Adônîs, whose wounds were shown, people sat on the ground with rent garments and wailed aloud. Then there sounded forth the instruments of mourning and the lamentation, "Alas, O Lord! Where is his glory?" ("Hôî! Ádôn," etc.). A sacrifice for the dead and a funeral concluded the mourning. On the day succeeding the seven days of lamentation it was said, "Adônîs lives, and is ascended!" And now, in the place of boundless grief and self-restraint, came unchecked pleasure and self-abandonment. Maidens sitting on the ground, and representing the mourning Aphroditê, waited for Adônîs, to whom they surrendered their virtue as an offering to Baaltis, and in return they gave their paramours a *phallus* (the *Linga* of India), the symbol of the god.

But at whose hands did the god of the young merry life of Nature sink into death? At those of Baal-Moloch or Baal-Hammân (Baal of Heat), the sun-god, in his scorching, life-destroying power. He is the Typhôn of the Egyptians. But the Phœnicians associated him with the life-giving god in one divine being, and this was certainly the original idea of the Egyptians also. For there is only one all-embracing Nature-life, which generates living things and again destroys them,



but then again annihilates this destruction and once more produces fresh life. Therefore, Baal-Moloch kills, not only Adônîs, but himself also, since he, as Baal of Tarsus, or, to speak more generally, as Hercules, burns himself. This self-destruction, however, befalls the deity by no means merely when regarded as masculine, but also in its feminine manifestation, and that not only through pain and grief, as in the case of Aphroditê, but also through actual death. Thus the Phœnician Astartê—Dido, the mythical foundress of Carthage—ends her life upon the pyre.

Accordingly, if not merely generation and birth, Human sacrifices. but death also, belongs to the nature of the deity, it is only natural to think that, as by doing the first, so also, by suffering the last, one may become like the deity, and may thereby show him honour. If it was felt that one must offer one's chastity to the divinity, then life also must be sacrificed in his service. The Phœnician and the Canaanite sacrifices of children, which were offered to Moloch, or, as the Greeks and Romans called him, Cronos or Saturn, are well known. In particular it was believed that the deity would be appeased by the offering of what was held most dear; and just on this account the only children of parents of high rank, even of kings, were sacrificed.<sup>1</sup> The Carthaginians offered, by a decree of the State, after reverses in war, two hundred boys of the most illustrious families, all at one time, and besides this, three hundred sacrifices more were voluntarily supplied.<sup>2</sup> In this frightful custom there is a touch of sublimity which is in wonderful contrast to the conduct in other respects of this nation of merchants. On this side also the Canaanite worship did not fail to make an impression even on the best minds of Israel, and to incite them to imitate it as for example in the offering up of Jephthah's daughter.<sup>3</sup>

On this very account, the offering of Isaac stands at the beginning of the history of Israel, in order to preserve the people from this kind of worship.<sup>4</sup> How deeply rooted in the minds and customs of the Phœnicians human sacrifices were, is

---

<sup>1</sup> 2 Kings, iii., 27. <sup>2</sup> Diodor. xx., 14. <sup>3</sup> Judges xi., 30, seq. <sup>4</sup> Gen. xxii.

proved by the fact that even the Roman Empire, with its severe prohibitions, could not eradicate them in the province of Carthage, until they at last vanished before the influence of Christianity.

In the same direction as these horrible sacrifices does the self-mutilation of the priests and devotees, in the service of this terrible deity, point. Self-mutilation in honour of Rhea—the goddess corresponding to Moloch or Cronos—prevailed, at one time, to such an extent in Syria, that King Abgarus issued an edict that whoever was guilty of this conduct should have his hands cut off. The worshippers believed that through such a sacrifice they would become like the deity. For, as in the burning of living beings, so also in this act, they supposed they were but imitating what had happened to the deity himself. The Theogony of Hesiod, in the account of the mutilation of Ouranos by Cronos, has evidently adopted this abominable notion though originally alien to Indo-Europeans.<sup>5</sup> Now, if the deity was served by those who had mutilated themselves in his honour (the so-called Galli), it is not strange that the great kings of Mesopotamia, themselves gods or representatives of the deity, surrounded themselves with eunuchs. Semiramis is said to have introduced the custom of this kind of mutilation into that country. The meaning of this statement is simply that this practice was adopted in honour of the goddess of Nature, whom we have recognised in Semiramis.

Interchange  
of sex. And lastly, it was supposed that it was possible to become like the deity through a sort of interchange of the sexes. Ninus becomes Ninyas or Sardanapalus; Hercules becomes, in conduct and dress, a woman like Omphalê, while Omphalê, on the coins of Sardis, wears a lion's skin and carries a club. Similarly, Semiramis becomes a warlike hero. Then priests and priestesses, male and female

---

<sup>5</sup> The foreign origin of this myth betrays itself clearly in the name of the instrument which Cronos used. The "Harpê" can be derived only from the Semitic "Hereb," (knife, sword; Arabic, Harbah lance). Theogony, 179. Plutarch shows that this notion also belonged to the Egyptians: "Isis and Osiris," 18.

votaries, imitate the gods in this. It is probable that these hosts of armed priestesses gave rise to the legends about the nations of Amazons. The law of Moses opposed with the greatest severity such an interchange of dress between the two sexes, on account of its religious significance and the abominable immoralities which ensued.<sup>1</sup>

In these religious customs, as well as in the ideas of the Hamites, with regard to the androgynous nature of the deity, we may probably find the origin of what was, in later times, called "the Grecian Vice" (sodomy). For while this is foreign to the disposition of Indo-European nations, it was, according to the evidence of the Old Testament, common among the Hamites. Again, from kindred notions of divine incest, according to which the god was son and husband of his mother, or again brother and husband of his sister, resulted the incestuous customs of these nations. Moreover, through the abominable commingling of the divine, the human and the animal, especially among the Egyptians, still more horrible vices became possible.<sup>2</sup> The Old Testament speaks of all these things comprehensively as the sins of the Canaanites, and declares that the Promised Land had spued out its inhabitants on account of such loathsome practices.<sup>3</sup>

Let us turn from these most extremely abominable developments of the Hamitic character to a general review of the whole subject, and let us endeavour to define the nature of Hamitic religion in general on the basis of our representation of the Egyptian, Mesopotamian, and Phœnician cults. It is quite unmistakable that the worship of light and of the heavenly bodies, and above all, that of the sun and the moon, underlies these religions. But this worship of the heavenly bodies is only the outer covering or visible form of what we must consider the essence and soul of Hamitic religion. *That is, the identification of the life of the deity with the life of Nature. The deity is dragged down to the depths of Nature-life in generation, birth and death. The divine is completely materialised.* If, however, we

Nature of the  
Hamitic  
religion in  
general.

<sup>1</sup> Deut. xxii., 5.

<sup>2</sup> Döllinger, p. 426, seqq.

<sup>3</sup> Levit. xviii.

wish to have this fundamental view expressed in its modern philosophical form, it is the Pantheism or the Monism of our own day. In this sense, according to Diodorus,<sup>1</sup> the Chaldæans affirmed that the world was in its nature eternal, that it never had a beginning and could never have an end; this was, in accordance with their correct interpretation, the meaning of Bêrôsus' cosmogony.

In striking contrast to this Hamitism, stood forth in those ancient times the religion of the Old Testament as the Religion of the *Holiness* of God. But the religions of the Indo-European nations also were originally far removed from such a materialisation of the Divine.

---

<sup>1</sup> Diod. II., 30.

### CHAPTER III.

#### THE CULTURE - ENDOWMENTS AND THE PRIMITIVE RELIGION OF THE INDO- EUROPEANS.

**A**S a certain result of modern science, we may point to the discovery that the great series of important nations, which are comprised under the name of Indo-Europeans, or Aryans, consists of nearly-related tribes which were originally united with one another. The most prominent and (owing to the part they have played in the history of mankind, in ancient as well as in modern times) most important members of that chain of nations are the *Aryan Hindús*, who, at an early period, immigrated into India, which was then inhabited by nations of a different race; the Persians, with their kindred tribes, who extended from Bactria to Armenia; the Greeks and the Romans; the Kelts; the Slavonians and the Teutons. From a manifold intermixture of Roman, Keltic and Teutonic elements in the population proceeded the Romance nations, so important in mediæval as well as in modern history. Comparative philology has proved the affinity and common origin of the languages of these nations. Of like importance is the recognition of the fact that the elements of religion and morality belong to them all in common. Not less clearly do their deep and widely comprehensive similarities in historical achievements allow us to conclude the primitive connexion with one another of the Indo-European race. There are, moreover, deep and significant distinctions which separate the nations of this race from the Hamites as well as from the Semites.

Affinity of  
the Aryan  
tribes.

Indications with regard to the origin of the human race as a whole, as well as that of the Indo-European nations in particular, point to Upper Asia. *There*, on mountains or lofty table-lands, dwelt the primitive race, from which the individual<sup>4</sup> branches sprang.

While the Hamites settled in fruitful, alluvial plains, or like the Phœnicians, on the sea-coast, while the Semites again chose for them deserts or tracts of land bordering on deserts, the Indo-Europeans seem to have preferred mountains and valleys, though the heights were often rough and inhospitable, and unfavourable for developing the first germs of civilisation. Perhaps this explains the fact that at a later time we find their scattered families predominatingly in the north. Coming from cool highlands they sought the colder climates. Only the force of circumstances compelled tribes, like the Hindûs, to descend to the hot plains of the Ganges, or at a later period in the migrations of nations, forced the Vandals to come to North Africa. From Asia, passing over the isthmus formed by the Caucasus mountains, or through Asia Minor, crossing over the Straits to Europe, they migrated from the north to the three peninsulas of the Mediterranean, where they naturally found their southern limit.

Their earliest condition. While dwelling in their earliest Asiatic settlements, the primitive Indo-European nations carried on the breeding of cattle and also a certain kind of agriculture. So far as history permits us to see, we find neither among the Hamites, nor the Semites, nor again the Indo-Europeans, conditions of savagery or the simple state of Nature. Before the Indo-European nations separated from one another, the most essential elements of civilisation were already in existence, and the separate families took them abroad with them as their common heritage. The primitive Indo-European nation already spoke a noble, very copious and euphonious language, from which were afterwards gradually developed the various languages of this stock, as they present themselves to us in the history of the past, or as they still live. This development was, however, by no means a process of enriching and adorning only, but, on the contrary, it was in some

measure one of impoverishing and weakening. Whoever wishes to gain an approximate idea of the euphony of that original tongue should think of the poems of Homer or the hymns of the Vedas; or better still, should hear the liturgy and sermon or the singing in a church of Lithuania. For among existing nations this remarkable agricultural people, which has neither founded cities nor produced a literature, has preserved most faithfully the language and the state of civilisation of those primitive ancestors.

Now that primitive language, so far as we can judge of it from the words common to the languages derived from it, enables us to recognise also the main characteristics of the state of civilisation of the nation that spoke it. There were already houses and courtyards, fields and cattle. Villages and larger communities already existed. Our domestic animals surrounded their master almost in the same variety, especially the ox and cow, but also the horse, the sheep, the goat, and the pig, and, moreover, the goose and the duck. The faithful dog already guarded his master and his master's house.

But the energies of the people were not directed to pasturing only; they were already agriculturalists. There were fields fenced and cultivated, over which ran the plough, and in them grew cereals, barley, and perhaps also wheat, which the mill prepared for the use of man. In order, however, to prepare the field with the plough, animals must have been brought under the yoke; a wagon brought home the fruits of the field. In the houses, as well as on the altar, fire blazed; salt seasoned the food. They were also acquainted with metals, gold, silver, and bronze, but not with iron. The precious metals, however, were not used as means of exchange, but they possessed them as jewels in the treasury, or wore them as ornaments. The metal used for weapons was bronze. Cattle (*pecunia*) served as the measure of value.

Speaking generally, the breeding of cattle was still the basis of their whole manner of life and their means of subsistence to such an extent that it was often easy to return to a purely nomadic life. The primitive Indo-European nation was probably still in that peculiar state of transition in which



agriculture is only temporarily carried on and is subordinated to cattle-breeding. This union of the nomadic life with agriculture may be observed at the present day among many Arab tribes. It also appears that the division of the great eastern branch of the Indo-Europeans (or Aryans) into <sup>Indians and</sup> <sup>Iranians.</sup> <sup>Iránians</sup> (that is the Persians and allied tribes), and Hindús, was the result not only of a religious dispute, but also of the preference entertained by the Iránians for agriculture, and that of the Hindú tribes for the nomadic life.<sup>1</sup> And even in much later times some Persian tribes have remained nomads, because the character of their home does not permit them to do otherwise.

Their family life seems to have been simple and healthy. The wife and mother, as her names, common to these nations, prove, holds a position which excludes polygamy. She is not subject to the husband like a slave, but is co-equal in honour and respect; and as employments which demand strength fall to the husband's lot, so do spinning and sewing to that of the women of the family. The most important relationships appear to have been sacred and unchangeable from ancient times, for their names have been retained with great tenacity among the separate branches of the Indo-European nation. Speaking generally, we may infer that the Teutons have preserved the original state of things as regards marriage and family life. For the chastity and purity of these relations are of so delicate and tender a nature that they can only be preserved, or if lost never regained.<sup>2</sup> The virtues which Tacitus holds up to his depraved countrymen as belonging to the ancient Germans, were once the common property of the Indo-European tribes. We find that these virtues were lost in a greater or less degree among the nations which came into closer connection with the Hamites and their culture, as for

<sup>1</sup> Compare the five Gâthas or Collections of the Songs and Speeches of Zarathustra, his Disciples and Successors. Published by Dr. M. Haug. See also his Essays on the Pârsis.

<sup>2</sup> Except by the entrance into individual and national life of a new and divine principle—that which is bestowed when a man or a nation is brought anew into heart-union with GOD through our Lord Jesus Christ.—W. S. C. T.

instance among the Aryans in Hindûstân, among the Greeks, among the Kelts, among the Persians, finally also among the Romans. The ancient Germans remained in their northern home, separated from Hamitic culture, and therefore also preserved from their corruption of morals.

While we find that family life existed in strict and sacred forms among this primitive race, we can hardly say anything of their political life. The family, however, had expanded into a clan, and the clan into a tribe, out of which tribes at a later time grew separate nations—and at the head of each tribe stood a chieftain, a “*King*.” But if the power of this chieftain over his tribe was already extremely limited, the mutual connexion of the tribes themselves was a very loose one. These circumstances account for the wide dispersion of the Indo-European nations, and for their splitting up into such a large number of independent bodies. Among this primitive race the individual freedom and independence of the husband and head of the family were certainly developed in a high degree, as we find them still among modern Indo-European nations—among the Germans and the Persians, for example. How was this precious possession to be combined with the not less important matter of the subordination of the individual to the whole body? The solution of this problem was a question for the future decision of these tribes. In this respect they remind us of the nomadic tribes of Semites, which indeed have never advanced beyond this condition of the absence of political constraint. And yet what great talents for political organisation must we infer to have existed among the ancestors of the Persians, Romans, and Teutons! But they were indeed only talents which, like Art and Science, waited for the time and the circumstances which should develop them.

We have to picture to ourselves the Indo-European tribes of very early times as highly gifted children of a numerous family. Their wealth in genius, in Art and Science, in earthly goods, which will be in the future at their command, is to all appearance not yet in existence. What an error, however, one

Their talents  
as yet not  
manifested.

would be committing were he to deduce the whole of their later development from nothing! We must measure the great potential wealth of these tribes by what children usually possess in the province of religion and poetry. In Homer's time the Greeks still lacked almost all that we understand by the fine arts, architecturally designed temples, statues, and paintings. And yet he would show himself a very incompetent judge of the genius and talents of a people who, from the Homeric poems and their clear, striking, and yet so sharply delineated figures, could not infer the artistic gifts of the nation. From the religion and poetry of that primitive people, as far as we are able to form a general conception of them, we may draw a similar but more general conclusion with regard to the later achievements of the Indo-Europeans.

Religion:  
Leading idea of  
the Divine  
that of  
Brightness.

If we enter the domain of the religious ideas of the Indo-Europeans, there is no doubt that the fundamental conception of the Divine sprang from that of brightness, brilliancy, light. From this conception are derived the names of the Deity, or at least of the chief divinity, amongst most of the nations of our family. It is the root *Dir* which appears in the Latin words *Dicus*, *Dies*, *Deus*, *Ju-piter* *Diu-piter*; in the Greek *Zeus*, and also in *Theos* (*Deus*); in the Indian *Dera* and *Dyaus*; in the Irânic names of the evil spirits, the *Daêras*—modern Persian *Dir*, who, through the new god Ahuramazda, fell into the background, and lastly in the Lithuanian *Dievas*, and in the Old German *Thius*.<sup>1</sup> In the shining Light of Heaven, in which the Indo-Europeans recognised the deity, we have, however, not only to conceive of the physical substance, but of everything sublime, noble and powerful which these ancient people could think of. Before all else the light itself, or the power of Nature manifesting itself in the light, must have been viewed as a moral and personal Being, if a religious relation to him were to be at all possible.

That this really took place we perceive in the fact that among the ancient Indians, among Greeks and Latins, the

<sup>1</sup> Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, Bd. 1, pp. 775, 1

term "Father of Light," or "Father of Heaven" (Sanskrit *Dyaushpitā*, originally *Dyans-pitar*, Greek *Zeus-patēr*, and Latin *Jupiter*, originally *Juppiter - Jovis-pater*) has been preserved. If we wish, however, to form a more concrete conception of the God of Light, such as that primitive nation might have conceived of him, we must rather think of the *Varuṇa-Ouranos* and the *Ādityas* of the Āryans, as their figures already appear to be vanishing away in the most ancient hymns of the Vedas of India.<sup>1</sup> In order to comprehend the idea of these divinities of Light in all their sublimity, we must observe the distinction which the most ancient Indian view of Nature makes between the Heaven of Air and the Heaven of Light. "The Light has its abode not in the expanse of the atmosphere, but beyond it, in the infinite expanse of Heaven. It is not bound to the shining orb of the Sun, but it is an eternal Power, independent of him. The *Ādityas*, then 'the Immortal, the Eternal Ones,' are precisely that heavenly light in which the earliest belief of the Āryan nations already anticipated the primary cause of all motion and of all finite life; a thing which the Natural Science of to-day is recognising ever more and more clearly. Our deities of light must, therefore, not be confounded with the finite manifestations of light in the world; they are neither sun, nor moon, nor stars, nor the dawn; but on the contrary they, as it were, exist behind all these phenomena, being the eternal Bearers of this Bright Life—they are called *Asuras*, the 'Spiritual Ones.' As such they are free from all imperfections of material limitations. In them, as an ancient poet says, there is no distinction between the right and the left, there is neither front nor rear; they do not nod and do not sleep; they permeate everything like the omnipresent light; they look into evil and good."

\* How extremely ancient that distinction between the luminaries and that sublime primitive light is, we may recognise from the fact that this same view was entertained by the most

<sup>1</sup> The following account is based upon Roth, *Die höchsten Götter der Arischen Völker*, *Zeitschrift der deutschen morrenlandischen Gesellschaft*, 1852. Bd. VI., pp. 67, *seqq.*

ancient Semites also. For in Genesis I., 1, *sqq.*, the *light itself*, which belongs to the first day, is clearly distinguished from the *luminaries* which were created on the fourth. On the other hand, similar to these figures of light which "neither nod nor sleep," still remain certain characteristics of the Greek deities; for example, the peculiarity by which they are recognised when they walk among men, that "their eyes do not<sup>1</sup> wink."

Antiquity of  
Varuna's  
worship

The very high antiquity of Varuna is, moreover, indicated by the characteristic circumstance that "the Vedic bards in all their figures of speech preserve a holy awe in the presence of his inscrutable being, and guard against divesting him of his divine majesty by making him human." Along with this awe is, however, naturally united the endeavour to gain a conception of the exalted deity. Thus in a Vedic hymn it is said:—

"If in his vision I do merge myself,  
I deem his presence like the fiery glow,  
Where in the sky the Lord of light and dark  
His glorious person to my view displays."

Or they beheld Varuna, in glittering splendour, enthroned in his far-off palace, which is called "a high, hundred-gated seat," and around him the genii gathered to execute his will. Or at the shining dawn of day, he, with Mitra, one of the Âdityas, mounts a golden chariot, and at sunset a brazen one, and from it the two gods behold the eternal and the transient.

To the nature of Varuna and the Âdityas it belongs, finally, that the divinities are no less *Moral Forces* than *Powers of Nature*. In this very inter-penetration of the natural and the moral, the sensuous and the spiritual, we believe that we can recognise one of the most important characteristics of antiquity. Yet it is true that Varuna is the light, and the wind rushing through the atmosphere is his breath, and the sun his eye. But he is at the same time the originator of all the laws of nature: he has shown the heavenly bodies their

---

<sup>1</sup> This peculiarity belongs to the gods according to Indian tradition also. In the Nalopakhyaṇam, Bk. V., sl. 24, Damayanti recognises the gods and distinguishes them from her mortal suitor Nala by the fact that they neither perspire nor wink.—W. S. C. T.

ways, to men he has given intelligence, to the steed his strength, to the cow her milk. The rivers flow according to his precepts, and it is owing to him that they, though flowing without intermission, do not fill the ocean. And not less is he the Law-giver and Guardian of the moral order of the world.

Its gods of light, Varuna and the Âdityas, abhor sin and injustice, which, by their nature, belong to darkness. Again, as gods of light, they are also in a position to detect and to punish evil. Varuna surveys and pervades everything, he knows the thoughts and actions of all men. In order to represent this omniscience of his quite intelligibly, the imagination of the poets surround him with genii, who, by his order, indefatigable and incapable of an error, watch over heaven and earth, and notice every transgression of the divine commands. They are called his "spies" (*spasas*). Such spies, called by the same name, belong also to the Iranian Mithra, and sit "on all heights and watch towers." The punishments, however, which Varuna as judge ordains for sins are (besides those which all the gods can inflict through the withdrawal of outward peace and prosperity) with him, in particular, sickness and death. These are Varuna's "fetters," "ropes," with which he binds him whose foot seeks to overstep the appointed limits.

Again, it is a great grief to the worshippers of Varuna to know that they are guilty of daily transgressing the commands of this god. Alarmed, and far from vain self-righteousness, they flee to Varuna, and to the other Âdityas, to implore of them forgiveness of sin. There is no hymn addressed to Varuna and the Âdityas, in which we do not meet with supplications for the remission of guilt, as in those addressed to other gods we find petitions for wealth, honour and fame.

We have hitherto followed Roth's excellent account, because we believe that these ideas regarding the deity in reality approximate most closely to the views of the Indo-Europeans of primitive times. We shall prove this by comparison with the ideas of kindred tribes.

The Vedic hymns, those most ancient monuments of the literature of Indo-European antiquity, enable us to observe a



phase in the religious development of our fathers, which, in the mythologies of kindred tribes, has already almost entirely passed away and become obscured. For instance, if we look at the mythology of Homer, we find in it the peculiarly Greek stage of the development of religious ideas, which corresponds to the Indra-religion of the Âryan Hindûs, or the company of the gods worshipped by the ancient Germans. These are the concrete and tangible figures of the gods, so formed as to be palpable to the senses, which in their multiplicity completing, and at the same time excluding one another, give us the impression that they are rather deified men than divine powers. Thus the Indian Indra corresponds to the Greek Zeus, the German Thor or Donner; or again the Indian Rudra to the German Wuotan (= the Scandinavian Odhin). This assembly of the gods received, indeed, its highest perfection and an abiding importance solely through the genius of the Greek nation, and especially through the grand composition of the Ionic branch, the Homeric poems.

This stage of development is not the earliest, however. There no doubt preceded it a conception of the divine which—as shown by the Varuna religion, already vanishing away, even in the Rigveda—still endeavoured to retain the supernatural, mysterious nature of the deity. When this transition from the Varuna to the Indra religion took place among the still united Âryans—we may, perhaps, fix the date at about 1,500 years before Christ—then there occurred among one portion of them, the Îrânians, a reaction which received an embodiment in the Ôrmazd<sup>1</sup> religion of Zarathu<sup>2</sup>stra.<sup>2</sup> Among the Îrânians also, the western branch of the Aryans, this transition had already, to a great extent, been accomplished. For we find a great number of the Vedic gods recurring among the mythological figures of the Zendavesta; only that they are subordinated to Ôrmazd or Ahura-

<sup>1</sup> In the Avesta, this deity is called in full Ahura Mazda. —W. S. C. T.

<sup>2</sup> This (Zarathu<sup>2</sup>stra) is the original Avestic form of the name known through the Greeks as Zoroaster, and now called in the East *Zar<sup>2</sup>dusht* or *Zartusht*. —W. S. C. T.



mazda (as, for instance, the Âditya Mitra), or, like Indra, are placed in the ranks of evil spirits. The Zarathuſtrian reaction, however, evidently took place with the consciousness that with that transition a substantial alteration in the ancient ideas regarding the deity had come in. But while the Îrânians imagined that they were retaining the old religion, or returning to it, it happened, as it generally does in such circumstances, that here also something new was developed, which indeed preserved essential features of that old faith, but which nevertheless was in no wise identical with it.

The Zarathuſtra reformation indeed did not come to pass without sanctioning agricultural life and a settled home, which nevertheless in relation to the nomadic life of the Indian Aryans was certainly the later development. Zarathuſtra, in coming forward as the prophet of the religion of Ôrmazd, could appeal to the more spiritual reminiscences of Varuṇa and the Adityas in contrast to the sensuous religion of Indra; but he was obliged at the same time to re-affirm the more exalted conception of Ahuramazda and to found it upon a philosophical basis. And thus early happened among the Îrânians, what we see taking place at a much later time among the Hindûs in the Brahma religion, namely the philosophical resolution of the multiplicity of the sensuous gods into the unity of one comprehensive deity.

Whether indeed the early rise of the religion of Ôrmazd can be accounted for solely through the advanced civilisation of the Îrânians, while it was only after long wanderings and combats in the valley of the Ganges that the Indian Aryans reached that settled stage of culture in which the religion of Brahma arose, may here be left undecided. It is probable that Zarathuſtra became the founder of a religion not without foreign and perhaps Semitic influences; as on the other hand the Brahma religion partly rests upon those of Hamitic ideas.

Did  
Monotheism  
precede  
Polytheism?      Let us return to those early deities and ask the question whether an idea of the unity of God preceded the Polytheism of the Indo-European nations. In this respect also it seems that the Varuṇa religion is not far removed from the original. Besides Varuṇa

"the Embracer," there are five other Adityas:—Mitra "the Friend," Âryaman "the Benefactor," Bhaga "the Distributer," Aśva "the Sharer," Dakṣha "the Intelligent." In addition to those we have mentioned there was probably a seventh. Corresponding to these there are in the Zarathuṣtra religion the seven Amshaspands, the highest spirits, among whom Ahuramazda occupies a position of very special importance, similar to that held by Varuṇa among the Âdityas. Now in more recent times some with a certain predilection, have sought to prove that a belief in the Unity of God everywhere lay at the foundation of Indo-European Polytheism, and preceded it perhaps in the conception of a Dyaus, a Zeus, a Jupiter.

From the standpoint of the religion of Varuṇa, it is easy to show that these Âdityas are merely personified attributes of Varuṇa, who manifests himself as "the Intelligent Friend and Benefactor" of men. Yet here the problem before us is not merely to advance from the Polytheism of the Indo-Europeans to some kind of unity, but much rather on the basis of the original unity to explain the Polytheism which succeeded it. Here we must in the first place call attention to only two facts. The first is the indisputable result of the examination of all the Indo-European religions, according to which there nowhere occurs a merely accidental plurality of single gods, but everywhere a central point, a unity, around which the plurality in an organic manner, as it were in families, groups itself. This condition appears most clearly with regard to the Zeus of the Grecian Olympus. Not less certain, however, is it, on the other hand, that we nowhere find in history, in the domain of Indo-European mythology, a simple Unity, but always a plurality of gods.

This holds good not only of the Varuṇa religion described above, but even of the religion of Ōrmazd, which sprang from a monotheistic reaction. For not only do hostile divine powers oppose themselves to Ahuramazda, but divine Beings surround him also. Thus historical investigations lead us in the next place only to the supposition that the Indo-European religion was either originally Polytheistic, or at least that it resulted

from a belief in a divine Unity which contained within itself the germ of a plurality. This first conception of a plurality may naturally have been a simpler one than the multiplicity of divinities as we find them in later stages of development.

Character of  
the deities of  
the Aryans.

Now what was the nature and character of this divinity and these divinities of our earliest ancestors? Here perhaps we may once more begin with the religion of Varuna. Although we are far from regarding this, as shown to us in the Vedas, as precisely the religion of the primitive Indo-European nation,—certainly this religion in its concrete form cannot, historically speaking, be exactly reproduced—we nevertheless believe that we can learn therefrom some of the leading features of the latter. We attribute to this primitive religion a sublime ideal and moral character. It does not follow from this that this religion was of that abstract kind which the conceptions of the Âdityas or the Amshaspands<sup>1</sup> indicate. This may have been peculiar rather to the Âryans, and especially to the Îranian branch of that family. In the doctrine of Zarathuâstra this feature gained the victory, whereas in the Indra religion on the other hand more concrete features of the primitive time seem to have prevailed. A similar contrast between the abstract and the concrete, the rational and the fanciful or the poetic, is afforded by the classical mythologies of both the Romans and the Greeks.

Here also we are inclined to find the more primitive idea—speaking generally—on the side of the Greeks, because the fanciful corresponds better with the genius of a child-like primitive people. But we are not so much concerned at present with this contrast between the more sober and practical conception of religious matters on the one hand and the more poetical and spiritualised view of them on the other. The primitive religion, even if principally of the latter character, must nevertheless have offered more than one starting-point for such a development as we find in Roman mythology.

Let us here emphasise one aspect of Nature with which the Roman genius, as well as the Greek, was in accord. Like the

<sup>1</sup> In the Avesta "Amesha Spentas."—W. S. C. T.

Âdityas, and especially Varuna himself, the deities of antiquity were of a sublime nature, and remote from the humiliation, the sin and the suffering of humanity. The peculiarly Hamitic idea that the deity, like everything living, partakes of suffering and death, was entirely foreign to the primitive religion of the Indo-Europeans. Such a fate agrees as little with the fundamental view of the religion of the Western Indo-Europeans as it does with the nature of Varuna or that of Ahuramazda. Let us here consider one of the most important ground-ideas of the Divine prevalent among the Greeks. It is the *happiness* and the *joyousness*, the *blessedness* and *immortality* of the gods. Even Strabo says, "Although it is well said that men imitate the gods most when they do good, yet it would be still better to say when they are happy." Their being immortal is an essential part of this happiness of theirs. Thus Sappho says, "Death is an evil, otherwise the gods would have chosen death." To be immortal and unfading is one of the highest but unattainable desires expressed by men in Homer. The gods are so. To this is added the unruffled serenity of the element in which they live on the top of Olympus, which is neither agitated by the wind nor shaken by the storm, nor does snow fall on it, but unclouded brightness is diffused there, and dazzling lustre canopies it. In it, they say, the blessed gods rejoice every day. And just as serenity pervades the ether, so through the ranks of the higher gods there glide figures which minister to their joy and happiness, such as the Muses, the Graces, the Hours, Harmonia, Hêbê, Ganymede—from whose very names there echo forth to us joy, beauty, measure and grace.<sup>1</sup>

If therefore Hercules dies a terrible death on the funeral pile, he is indeed the Eastern, or rather the Hamitic, god whom the Greeks have appropriated to themselves. And the idealising Greeks could appropriate him only\*in an entirely different sense. According to the Hamitic view the god dies, as the life of Nature does, in order to live and to die again ; to

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Homer, *Odyss.* IV., 563—568.

die belongs to the nature of the deity. According to the Greek view, Hercules dies because he is not yet truly God, and in order to divest himself of everything human and un-divine, and thereafter to enter upon the blessed, eternal life of the gods, and with Hêbê to enjoy eternal youth.

Hamitic influences in Greek myths. If the gods cannot die, neither could they be born. If we look back at Varuna and the Âdityas, we perceive that such an origin would not harmonise with the original conception of them. The same holds good with regard to the fundamental idea of a Zeus among the Greeks. If Zeus is said to have been born in Crete, and his grave also was shown there, this means nothing else than that here, as in Cyprus, the Greek Zeus was confounded with the Baal of the Phœnicians. From Hamitic (and in the first place Phœnician) influences arose, principally the Theogonic myth of the origin of Zeus from Cronos and Ouranos, as the thoroughly Hamitic feature of the mutilation of Ouranos by Cronos clearly indicates. While, however, Cronos belongs rather to the Hamitic circle, the descent of Zeus from Ouranos, shows his original identity with the primitive Indo-European God of light and of the sky, the Varuna-Ouranos. Zeus himself is essentially the same, only viewed in a characteristically Greek manner. How little, however, birth regarded as something to be undergone by men, becomes the Deity—according to the Greek (and, we may say the fundamental Indo-European) view—is clearly shown in the beautiful myth of the origin of Athênê, who, in a perfect form and fully armed, sprang from the head of her father Zeus.

#### *GREEK CONCEPTIONS OF DEITY.*

If we wish to picture to ourselves generally what the Greek gods were to the people, we must think, not so much of any fable of any particular poet or mythologist, as of the sublime figures which sculptors presented to the people, and in which the people recognised their gods. In these eternally beautiful figures, indeed, is embodied the permanent and enduring gift

which the Greek religion, nay rather all Indo-European mythology, has offered to the progressive culture of the human race. Everything else contained in Greek and Indo-European mythology and religion has perhaps a value for the learned investigator, yet for him alone. The figures of gods, presented to us by Homer and the Grecian sculptors are and remain the foundation of all our perception of the beautiful. In this permanent and eternal bequest which they have left us, we have, therefore, to look for the true work not only of the Greek but also of the Indo-European genius. Let us now listen to Winkelmann's well-known words about the Vatican Apollo: "Exalted above humanity are his proportions, and his attitude testifies to the greatness which he embodies. An eternal spring-tide, such as reigns in blissful Elysium, clothes the graceful manhood of maturity with the charms of youth, and with gentle tenderness plays over the proud stature of his limbs. Enter thou in spirit into the realm of incorporeal beauty, and strive to create a celestial being, so as to fill thy soul with beauties which transcend nature; for *here* there is nothing mortal, nothing which human infirmity demands. No veins warm nor do muscles move this body; on the contrary a celestial spirit, poured forth like a gentle stream, fills, as it were, the whole outline of this figure."

To complete the picture, let us add what Anselm Feuerbach says of this work of art, "This Apollo is neither child, nor youth, nor full-grown man, but all this at the same time; he is a child without the weakness of childhood, and a youth with the strength and stability of a man. It is quite impossible for our powers of imagination to think of a temporal course of development in connexion with this figure; or to believe in the possibility of its descent, at a later time, to human transitoriness. A moment has called him into existence, but it was an eternal one. This conception of an eternal youth is to no slight degree enhanced by the fact that, as Winkelmann expresses himself, 'no veins warm nor do muscles move this body.' In this way he becomes, as it were, a body, composed of fine ethereal materials, which exists only in order to give to spirit and soul a visible manifestation, without any



medium; there is nothing to remind us of the process of nutrition, and of constant temporal wants; the bodily frame has no right, and no longer any life peculiar to itself, and thus exempted from transitoriness and death it shares the immortality of the spirit."

The Gods are immortal. In the first place, and according to the original conception of them, the Hellenic, as well as the Indo-European gods in general, are considered to be immortal and imperishable, and therefore also they did not come into existence by birth, nor at all like to mortal man. Only later reflection, which inquired into the origin of the gods, who gradually came to be considered more and more like men, and into their relationship to one another, attributed to them in different ways birth and beginning of existence. But the simple consciousness of the people by no means deduced from such a beginning the idea of their transitoriness and death, but on the contrary held fast to the original view of their immortality. Therefore, however frequently it may have been related that Apollo was born at Delos, yet, as far as the religious consciousness was concerned, he was and continued to be the ever youthful god, the constant announcer of his father's will, and like Zeus himself, imperishable as the eternal Light. If, therefore, the religion of the Romans does not in general recognise such family ties among the gods, it is because the rational mind of this people has evidently, in this matter, held firmly to a feature of the primitive religion already mentioned.

Indo-European deities originally neither male or female. But we must go still further and affirm that the primitive gods of the Indo-Europeans lacked also the distinction of sex. In this respect we have referred in the first place to Varuṇa and the Âdityas. But even the Greek religion leads us to the same conclusion. And here "the exception proves the rule." The pure and noble connexion of father Zeus with Athênê-Minerva, and of Apollo with his sister Artemis, shows that in these truly Grecian deities the sexual relation is entirely transformed into the ideal and thereby set aside. Here indeed Schiller's maxim holds good: "He who woos a goddess



must not expect to find in her a woman." In the chaste figure of Artemis especially, it seems that the Indo-European mind wished to exhibit the most decided contrast to the Artemis of Ephesus, the Hamitic goddess of Nature.

Finally, Aphroditê herself, the goddess of love, shews plainly by her surnames of "the Cyprian" and the goddess "of Cythêrê," in the first place her Phœnician, and consequently her Hamitic origin; as according to Hesiod's Theogony also she sprang from the foam of the sea, into which the blood of the mutilated Ouranos had flowed. But in the noble and graceful figure of the Grecian goddess, when compared with the voluptuous goddess of the Hamites, it is clearly evident what a power Greek idealism must have possessed to effect such a transformation. In the course of the development of Greek mythology his noble consort was first associated with Zeus. This is proved by the difference of the persons to whom that honour was assigned in different places. In Dodona his consort was said to be Diônê, in Argos Hêrê, in other districts Latôna, the mother of Apollo and Artemis. Neither Varuṇa nor Ahuramazda, who in other respects resemble Zeus in their nature, occupies a similar position in relation to a consort.

**The Divine in the female.** In accordance with the original character of Indo-European, and especially of Grecian, mythology indeed the female element ought not to be, and could not be wanting therein. On viewing the archetypes of beauty in the Hellenic Olympus, who would not miss half of its ideals if Athênê, Artemis, Hêrê, and Aphroditê were absent? But the feeling which compelled the Indo-Europeans to admit the feminine principle into their conception of the divine and thereby to idealise it, was quite a different one from that which led the Hamites to recognise in the distinction of the sexes the nature of the deity. As Athênê and Artemis (whom we may regard as the Âdityas surrounding Zeus-Varuṇa) clearly show, there are indeed ideal qualities in feminine nature entirely independent of sexuality, which the Greek recognised and venerated in his goddesses. And even with regard to the goddess whom they had borrowed from the Hamites, grace and

beauty, the gift of the Greeks, must have originally been the vesture and veil in which is modestly concealed what, among the Hamites, was exposed to the gaze of all.

Let us take up once more the subject of the immortality of the gods. In direct contradiction to this seems to be, the belief of the ancient Teutons that the gods would finally come to an end. A pathetic prelude to this death of the gods is the end of Baldr, the god of light. But we must not forget that we have to deal with a mythological idea which, as regards distance and time, is far removed from the origin of the Indo-European religion. In the most northerly regions inhabited by people of the Teutonic race, where during the long night of winter the light seemed to have permanently set, such a prophecy of the "setting" of the gods could easily develope itself. Yet this "setting" also was to be followed by their rising again. It requires no more direct proof that this religious characteristic of the Teutonic mythology must not be confounded with the Hamitic view which we have previously explained.

On the other hand it will be clear that in  
Contrast  
between Gods  
and men. contrast to this majesty and imperishable blessedness of the gods, the feeling of human transitoriness must have gained special strength. It appears to us that on this contrast is based one of the most important traits in the character of the ancient Indo-Europeans. It is the leading idea in the Indo-European epic, being common to the Indian Mahābhārata, the Homeric Iliad, the German Nibelungenlied, and was worked out in various ways, and yet always in a touching manner. In all these three poems there is a wonderfully majestic hero, the prototype of his nation, who is snatched away by an early and bloody death. And this hero is always raised as high above common humanity and approximated as closely to the divine nature as a sudden death permits. These heroes are generally sons of the gods, and on account of this origin they should indeed be unassailable. But on the other hand they are also children of men and must pay the tribute of human nature.

It would contradict the root-elements of Indo-European

religion were we to view the tragedy of our epics as a tragedy of the gods, and were thus to perceive in the sons of the Gods, Karna, Achilles, and Siegfried, only the concealed gods of light themselves. On the contrary, the divine origin of our heroes means nothing else than what is expressed in the idea common to all the Indo-Europeans, that their kings and most noble families are descended from the gods. In the sudden death of these most distinguished heroes, the common fate of humanity most powerfully affects our minds. Yet they do not perish alone, but as chiefs they fall with the armies in which the most noble of the people are enrolled. Thus in the Nibelungenlied the Burgundians, in the Mahābhārata both the hostile royal races of the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas fall in battle. If the Iliad represents only Patroclus, the friend of Achilles, and his noble opponent Hector, with a few other heroes as falling in battle, and moreover lets us see only from afar the death of Achilles, the chief hero, we see in this but true Hellenic moderation. The Homeric Epic is filled with sadness, but here artistic moderation is still observed. Of the Mahābhārata and the Nibelungenlied, we must perhaps say that the measure of sadness is in excess.

The transitoriness of men. The root idea of the common myth from which the great epics of the three Indo-European nations arose is grief on account of the suddenness of the death of the noblest, of the transitoriness of the human race. The blessed and immortal gods above, and here below races subject to death and their representatives, the more excellent they are the more suddenly and violently are they swept away. This thought must have stirred the mind of our forefathers to its very depths. An evidence of this is that common myth regarding the sudden end of the sons of the gods, which had already before the separation of these nations from one another taken definite shape, and as an important heritage accompanied them when they separated. This heritage was indeed poetically worked out in grand epics, not by all nations but only by those nations which possessed especial artistic talents. Among the Greeks and Germans accordingly, tragedy itself also at a later time arose on this basis, not however without

new and foreign influences, that is to say, among the former through Hamitic influences, and among the latter through those of Christian origin. Of this, however, we shall speak further on.

Let us add two remarks more to what has been said above. The lamentation over death in these epics has nothing whatever to do with the guiltiness of mankind. The death of these heroes appears as an inevitable fate, to which the human race is subject, and which must be bewailed and lamented but cannot be explained. Questions about sin and guilt come to the fore only at a later stage of development. To these questions tragedy attaches itself. Our second observation is that to those primitive Indo-Europeans the existence after death must have appeared a sad and mournful one. We have reason to presume that death was by no means regarded by them as annihilation; but, on the other hand, they did not hold the view which meets us among the Hamites, that the wicked in the life to come would suffer terrible punishments, but the good would enjoy supreme happiness. It is probable that the Greek ideas about the Elysian Fields, or the torments of Tantalus, are of Hamitic origin. The primitive Indo-European view was very probably that the life after death was a gloomy, cheerless, shadowy existence.

Let us return to theological conceptions. If light constituted the element and nature of the gods, and their actions therefore were also light and harmony, and their rule in the world order and law, then whatever there was in the world contrary to this could be traced back only to powers of an antagonistic kind. In opposition to the deities of light there stood forth from the beginning gods of darkness and evil, of storm and devastation. Such powers we see among the Hindûs and Îrânians opposed to the gods of light. Among the latter they are united and comprehended in Ahriman. Among the Greeks they are the Titans; among the Germans the giants of Frost and Ice. It is, however, a mistake to suppose in the Hellenic mythology a change of dynasty among the gods, as if the deities of Olympus had

succeeded the Titans. Zeus is indeed the Grecian representation of the deity which was worshipped in common by all the Indo-Europeans, and is consequently as ancient as themselves. Among the Greeks the harmonious, serene, beautiful and even nature of the deity has so thoroughly triumphed over the Powers of Disorder that the latter appear rather to be wholly subdued. In this respect there is a great difference between the views of the Eastern Âryans and the Western, for among the Teutons there prevailed the idea that the continuous struggle will result, temporarily at least, in harm to the supernal gods.

Now in the first place it might appear as if by such a struggle the bliss and happiness of the gods would be done away with. Here, however, we must bear in mind that all the Indo-European nations were originally fond of battle and strife. We see this most clearly expressed in the Teutonic idea of Odhin and his Valhalla. Accordingly battle and strife belong also in a particular sense to the life of the deity, just as they are necessary for the contentment of men. It is easily understood that this idea is of very different range among different nations. On the other hand it clearly follows from this circumstance that the higher gods were from the first considered as only one party in the universe, though the rightful one. Their power is very great, and yet again it is limited. As among men nation opposes nation, only that foreigners considered as barbarians are also devoid of right, so the gods of light had from the first to do with these malicious demons. If it were therefore even possible to prove that a Varuna-Ouranos or a Dyans (Zeus, Jupiter) was the *one* deity of light or heaven worshipped by the primitive Indo-Europeans, yet this deity could never have been considered as the Almighty God of heaven and earth, like the GOD of Israel, but as limited by the Powers of Darkness. Nor was he limited by these alone. For between these high Deities of Light and these Dark

**The Earth.** Powers there is still a third party, which occupies, so to speak, a middle position. That is the Earth and the Atmosphere. It is certain that the view which raises the earth to the rank of the divine or even exalts her "as

mother of gods and of men" above the gods themselves, is one which arose much later. It entirely contradicts that primitive view of the sublimity of the gods of heaven. On the contrary we should perhaps find the most ancient conception in the Greek name of the earth "Gæa," which corresponds to the German word "Kuh" (the English "Cow.") The earth appeared as the cow of the gods, which received from the deities of light her prosperity, just as she returned thanks for it through sacrifices offered by the hands of men. Thus the earth was in a certain manner to the gods what the cow, the most important domestic animal, was to man. In the same way the clouds appeared as cows, which again ministered to the earth the rain so necessary for her prosperity. Only in the course of later development could the earth be raised to the rank of a goddess.

Gradual  
lowering of  
the conception  
of the Divine.

For if once the divinity of the Indo-Europeans was of a nature cognisable to the senses, even if it were by far the most ideal and sublime thing in the sphere of the universe, then natural objects could not fail to be gradually more and more drawn into the circle of the divine. This development may be recognised with particular clearness in the gradual change of the Varuṇa religion into the Indra mythology among the Hindûs. It is already a very decided descent from that ideal height, when Varuṇa and the Âdityas have to share the worship paid to them with Agni, the god of fire. But how natural is it on the other hand to behold in the fire, which the lightning brings to the earth from the circle of those deities of light, and in the fire on the hearth, the benefactor of men, a messenger of those gods or one of their circle. And lastly in the drink-offering likewise, which those gods of light made to grow on earth for their delight, something divine was seen; consequently Soma occupied a place beside Agni.

Even if the original deity was the light beyond the sky, the original source of the light which manifests itself and produces its effects here on earth, yet the divine character must have suited the latter also. Then, however, it was only a natural consequence to regard as, in some respects, divine the terrestrial



objects also which absorb the light. Why should not lake and river and fountain, in which the light mirrors itself, be related to the deity, or again the vegetable kingdom which owes its origin to the light? Why not the earth as a whole in so far as it absorbs the light and is fructified by the light?

**The Spiritual and ideal, not the material, divine.** Among the Indo-European nations, however, this lower world is exalted to a divine elevation only so far as it is illuminated and glorified from above. It is not matter in itself which is divine, not the Hylê, which is rather opposed to the divine. On the contrary it is the world as it lives and receives its form in the light. We may also say that it is the *ideas*<sup>1</sup> of terrestrial existences, the geniuses of things, so far as they are the formative and life-giving powers, that are so regarded. Let us therefore consider as the general Indo-European way of looking at things what Lehrs affirms with regard to the Greek religion in particular. "The Greek is a most decided idealist, in direct contrast to the blank materialism of more recent times. In mountain, grotto, river, waves and the like, the material part interests him not at all, in his sight it entirely fades away. What does concern him, what interests and affects him, is the grace, the clearness and the movement of the fountain, the unchanging might of the river, the shady darkness of the grove, the luxuriant moisture of the meadow, the play of colour on the waves of the ocean—in short, it is these and other similar *spiritual* qualities, as it were, which react upon his soul. These he does not regard as qualities belonging to a body, but he feels them to be manifestations of life, forms of divine activity; and these divine energies at once become to him divine figures, divine persons."

Again, Lehrs brings into prominence the ethical character of these so-called "Religions of Nature." In Hêlios the Greek did not worship the sun, but the god who causes the sun to rise, and bestows upon men the benefit of light. In Zeus he adored not the heaven, but the high ethical divine personality, "that gained by lot the heaven in ether and clouds."<sup>2</sup> Among

<sup>1</sup> In Plato's sense of the word.—W. S. C. T.

<sup>2</sup> Iliad XV. 192.



the Greeks in the bloom of Indo-European mythology there was preserved, and at the same time developed in a peculiar manner, precisely that ideal and ethical character which we ascribe to the Indo-European genius in general.

Now it is indeed in accordance with human nature that to such ideal conceptions of the gods there should correspond also ideal features in the subjective religion and ethics of our fore-

History  
contradicts  
the theory of  
man's uniform  
advance.

fathers. History emphatically contradicts the modern view, according to which the development of mankind proceeded solely from below upwards, from the animal to the human. It is true that we see nations advance from the simple to the complete, from the undeveloped to the developed stage. Children became men. But whatever nobleness and wealth of ideals are afterwards manifested in their history, must have been possessed by them as natural endowments when they entered upon their course of development. Our forefathers took with them not only an objective inheritance in ideal conceptions of the gods, but also a subjective one, in piety, honesty, respect for chastity, patriotism and other virtues. These endowments appear, however, to have been variously distributed and blended among the individual nations, and to have been also in different degrees limited by immoral tendencies. We see these national virtues embodied in their epic ideals. Let us call to mind Hector's patriotism and his defiance of death, Achilles' faithfulness to a friend and his magnanimity, or Siegfried's guilelessness, the fidelity to his clansmen of a Rüdiger and even of a Hagen. Herodotus, in speaking of the ancient Persians, calls attention to the fact that in the education of their youth they attached a special value to veracity. By the ancient Bactrian nation prederasty was considered as an "inexpiable" sin.<sup>1</sup> To the Germans in particular belonged a respect for chastity and a moral regard for marriage and family ties, not in the high conception of them entertained by Christianity, yet in one that is fairly comparable with that found in the Old Testament. We see their defiance of death and the slight value set upon

---

<sup>1</sup> See the first chapter of the *Vendidad*.

their own lives, which characterised the Teutons, was, however, connected also a disregard for the lives of others. Money atoned for bloodshed, or bravery degenerated into a wild, brutal rage for destruction. The thief and the rogue were always despised among the ancient Germans, whereas to slaughter and murder their conscience remained insensible.

Again, what a strong sense of justice and what an ardent desire for it must we suppose to have existed among the Roman nation, who were destined to become the Legislators of mankind, as the Greeks were their instructors in art.

Let us, however, turn from the particular to the general. In the very nature of the Indo-Europeans there was rooted an ideal regard for the divine, as well as a deeply moral absorption in the eternal laws of conscience, which at the same time constitute the moral order of the world. The gods are,—as is already evident with regard to Varuna and the Âdityas,—the guardians and avengers of the natural as well as of the moral order of the Universe. Piety and morality were most closely connected together among the Indo-Europeans—so closely indeed that with the former the latter also must decline. The ideal worlds into which the pious and the moral man raise themselves are one and the same. In worshipping, such a man receives strength from it; in looking to this invisible world and so in believing in it, the Greeks and Romans were enabled to sacrifice all worldly possessions, and even life itself. It was indeed their vital connexion with the ideal world, whether it was called Olympus or Valhalla, from which arose their practical carrying out of the maxim that life is not the highest good. Without ideal aims, the ultimate source of which is found in the gods, and without the strongest moral forces, how would the development of the Roman Empire have been possible? Here it would be folly to apply the saying of Augustine: “The virtues of the heathen<sup>1</sup> are but splendid vices.”

<sup>1</sup> This maxim is in entire antagonism with the teaching of the whole Bible. One sentence is sufficient to prove this: “Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him (Acts x., 34, 35).—W. S. C. T.

**Early civilisation.** In conclusion, let us say one word more with regard to the extent of the culture-endowments in a wider sense, possessed of which the Indo-European nations dispersed far and wide. If that religio-moral embryo, so to speak, the character of which we have striven to recognise, cannot be supposed to have remained undeveloped, we must consider as simply endowments almost all the other capabilities of progress in civilisation, through the employment of which the nations of this family have become the rulers of the world. We must not, however, think too disparagingly of the language and poetry of this primitive people. In those very early times we must not look for highly-developed wisdom, but for the poetry, rich and full of promise, of a highly-gifted, child-like spirit and mind. This will become more and more clear to us from comparative mythology.

At the present time most one-sided theories assert themselves in this very recently-invented science. It is said that the source of all the mythology—that is to say of all the religion, all the poetry, all the thought and reflection of that primitive race—was nothing but a child-like observation of nature. It is even supposed that their whole mythology can be traced back to one great natural phenomenon—the thunder-storm. This theory has sprung from the modern way of looking at things, which will not admit anything to be true in all religion and science but what an acquaintance with Nature proves. Mythology is no more to be considered as confined to the sphere of Nature than is Natural Science to be confounded with the supernatural. All the great and simple emotions of the human heart, as they belong to the uncultured as well as to the cultivated (for example, veneration for the divine, love and hatred, fear and hope, and the like), may be sought in this primitive religion and poetry. But the peculiarity of the feeling and speech of mankind at an early stage is that they can express what is in their minds and intellects only through their views of Nature. If the ancient Germans could conceive of their soul only as “a troubled sea,”<sup>1</sup> what truth,

<sup>1</sup> This is the literal meaning of the Gothic word *Saivala*, from which the German *Seele* and the English *soul* are derived.—W. S. C. T.

what poetry, lies in this illustration borrowed from Nature ! The Epic similes derived from Nature are a relic of this primitive poetry and natural insight. Their views of Nature were, so to speak, the palpable coverings without which their thoughts and feelings could not reveal themselves. He alone, however, in whose opinion man in general is a purely material being, has the right to deny that these images are alive with spiritual conceptions.

Philology  
reveals early  
philosophic  
and poetic  
conceptions.

The language of this primitive people was poetry and philosophy. Even now it is still full of thought and poetry for the benefit of our philosophers and poets. Language was the great plastic and musical work of that period. *Singing* and *saying* were one and the same thing, just as *Dichten* and *Denken* (poeticising and thinking) were. If we have to disclaim for our forefathers poetry and philosophy in the more modern sense, yet in another sense we must attribute both to those ancestors, from whom Homer and Plato, Dante and Shakespeare, were to descend. If we inquire indeed about particular branches of knowledge, their number will be found to be very small. Philology seems to teach us that the numerals up to a hundred belong in common to all the Indo-European nations, and were therefore known to this primitive people, and that the *moon*, in their language, meant the "measurer of time." Among forms of industrial activity, spinning, sewing, and the forging of tools and weapons were practised. On the other hand the desire to inquire into and to investigate the nature of things belonged to these people, and they felt within themselves the power and the impulse to subjugate the earth to themselves, and to press all terrestrial forces into their service. Both warlike and peaceful nations are descended from them. Greeks and Romans, French and Germans, have known how to turn war into an art and science ; nay, they have turned battle into poetry.

The Indo-  
European a  
highly gifted  
race.

But however dear to these nations war may have been, yet their disposition in itself was never prone to plunder and strife. At the time of the great migration of nations, the Teutons did not after all carry on war for the mere sake of war, but to obtain arable land. The

Indo-Europeans have become business nations, devoted to commerce and industry. The Greeks surpassed the Phœnicians, and the Carthaginians, Venetians, Dutch and English have become the Phœnicians of modern days. Hellenic art and science derived their support from Grecian commerce. The Venetian and Dutch schools of painting are well known. And in England also poetry and science have sprung up from business pursuits.

Again, it is the effort to discover the truth, to inquire into the reason of things,—that is to say, science—that has led to our most marvellous dominion over the material world. Even in this the saying holds good, “Seek ye first ideal things, and all other things will be added to you.” We are still engaged in reaping the great harvest of material possessions which we owe to the ideal sowing of our fathers. It would be a falling away from the Indo-European character if earthly gain were to be considered an object in itself. Indeed the great difference between Tyre and Sidon, or Babylon and Nineveh on the one hand, and Athens and Rome on the other, lies in the fact that the former cities, though possessed of earthly power, glory and luxury, are for us merely witnesses to the transitoriness of things, while Rome and the Greek cities, in their ideal properties, remain for us, as it were, living and active.

It is true that the Indo-Europeans (as has already been pointed out, and will become clearer further on) received the beginning and the elements of their civilisation from the Hamites. But they have developed these with a superior mind and in an independent manner, and carried them to such a height that they must be regarded as the masters of the civilisation of the world. That is to say, the peculiar value of their achievements is not to be sought merely in the advancement of material civilisation, but in the ideal spirit which permeates the whole life of these nations, and which finds its chief expression in Art and Science.

Only in the domain of *Religion* do we see these nations dependent upon a third family, the Semites. However ideally endowed may have been the Indo-European religions, they have proved but transient. Of what kind, then, are those tribes, like the Jews and Arabs, from whom the most prominent civilised nations of the world have received their religions?



## CHAPTER IV.

### THE RELIGION OF THE SEMITES.

**I**F the Indo-Europeans dispersed themselves over the north, and the Hamitic nations formed a chain of settlements in the south, stretching from the north-west of Africa as far as the Nile, from Ethiopia across South Arabia to Babylon, and further on even to the Indus, we Early location of the Semites. may assign to the Semites a location midway between the two. Their settlements formed no connected chain. Perhaps we shall not be far from the truth if we ascribe to them as their own quite a small portion of the globe—that is to say the Arabian Peninsula, only that we have to conceive of the latter as extending to the mountains of Armenia and Cilicia and to the Mediterranean. But here also we must make some important deductions. The whole south of the Peninsula—Saba and Oman—was originally colonised by Hamites, as were also the coast of the Persian Gulf and that of the Mediterranean. From all sides, except perhaps the extreme north, the Semites were surrounded by Hamitic nations.

If, on the other hand, we consider the present state of the case, we find that the Semitic Arabs have taken possession of all those territories of the Hamites from the Pillars of Hercules to the Tigris; and Islâm stretches to the north and east much farther still.

From the very beginning the Hamites and the Semites were already destined, through their geographical position with respect to one another, to contend against each other; but the contest was not to be merely that of arms, but rather a struggle for



supremacy between the two systems of religion and civilisation. This strife at last ended in the complete victory of the Semites. For Abyssinia, a part of ancient Ethiopia, the remnant of the Hamitic domain, which alone remained unaffected by Islâm, has yet become Christian, and has thus in a similar manner accepted a religion derived from the family of Shem. But there *were* times when the genius of the Hamites was all-victorious, and the sun of Shem seemed to be near its setting. Those were the times when flourished the Hamitic civilisation which we have delineated above—that is to say the most ancient times of which we have here to speak.

Let us, however, in the first place, glance over the  
**Semitic Tribes.** list of the Semitic tribes. Not all of those that are brought before us in the genealogical Table of Nations<sup>1</sup> have become of historical importance to us. The Elamites may have been overwhelmed by Indo-European tribes, for at a later date we find the Persians in that country. The Assyrians, a Semitic nation, wholly passed over to Hamitic civilisation. We do not know Lud<sup>2</sup> as a Semitic people, for the Lydians of Asia Minor possess rather a Hamitic stamp. Of prominent importance by reason of their later development are only two tribes, the Aramæans and the Arphaxites. The former, "Semites of the Highlands," dwelling between the Lebanon and the Upper Euphrates, are the ancestors of the Syrians. The latter tribe, dwelling on the "Borders of the Chaldeans" (as the name Arphaxad—or more correctly *Arphachshad*—is supposed to signify), is that from which sprang the two chief nations of the Semites,—the Hebrews and the Arabs. From Arphachshad indeed there descended, in the first place, two great families—the Joktanite Arabs (the most ancient Semitic inhabitants of Arabia), and the family of the Hebrews in the wider sense of the word, which leads back to Abraham. And from Abraham again sprang the Hebrews (in the narrower sense of the word) and the Ishmaelites, as well as the Keturaean Arabs.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gen. x.

<sup>2</sup> But see Rawlinson's "Origin of Nations," where these questions are very clearly and succinctly dealt with.—W. S. C. T.

While the Arabs, in different successive streams, poured into the land which is called after them from the Borders of the Chaldeans, and through dwelling in the wilderness acquired a particular natural separation from and independence of the great Hamitic empires, the Hebrew nation found all the land in a measure already occupied. We see Abraham coming from Chaldaea to Haran in Syria, and proceeding thence to Canaan. At that time the land was already tenanted by Hamitic tribes. After a somewhat lengthy stay on the borders of Egypt, the Israelite nation, through the conquest and partial destruction of the Canaanites, obtained room for its development, even then remaining in close and constant relations to Hamitic nations, such as the Phœnicians and the Egyptians. Now the peculiarity of Israel is just this, that this nation, in spite of its constant contact with Hamitic civilisation, was preserved in its Semitism, and thereby kept safe for its special mission. The Joktanite Arabs, on the contrary, as conquerors of Yemen, fell away into Hamitism like the Assyrians in Mesopotamia. Only the desert of Arabia preserved the northern tribes, the Keturean and especially the Ishmaelite Arabs, in their Semitic character.

Now, what was the position of the pure Semites with regard to civilisation, and what was their religion?

Civilisation of the Semites. If we endeavour first of all to answer the former question, it becomes clear how little is here to be gained by drawing a contrast between civilisation on the one hand and its absence, or a state of nature, on the other. If we found among the Hamitic nations a magnificent but predominantly material civilisation, the beginning of which lies beyond the range of history,—if besides this we saw a primitive Indo-European people, devoid indeed of any advanced degree of civilisation, but endowed with the richest gifts for the development of a civilisation, mental as well as material, we finally, in the Semites, meet with another quite differently equipped national character. If the idea of culture is understood in the sense in which the Hamites laid its foundations, and the Indo-Europeans erected thereon the magnificent structure of modern civilisation, then the Semites, as a whole, must be excluded from the list of civilised nations. For while around

them flourished various forms of Hamitic civilisation, they were not only destitute of everything which could be compared with them, but history has also shown that they were, and still are, wholly incapable of receiving foreign elements of civilisation and of developing them in an independent manner, in a way similar to that adopted by the Indo-Europeans. This is most easily and clearly to be observed in the case of the Arabs. What the Bedouins were 3,000 years ago and even earlier, that they still remain in all essential points up to the present time. Just as an Abraham or an Ishmael, 4,000 years ago, wandered about as a Sheikh or Bedouin chief, so Arab tribes still roam to-day over the free soil of Arabia. When at one time Islâm united these tribes together, then indeed the Arab nation burst over the world like a storm from their own deserts, overthrowing empires and founding others in their stead. But a development of civilisation, such as is wont to go hand-in-hand with political growth, took place only upon non-Arabian soil, in Mesopotamia, Egypt or Spain,—that is to say, in foreign countries which had been the seat of an ancient civilisation.

The pure Arabs, though elevated in a religio-moral point of view, lived their old life in their native land without undergoing any essential change in the way of culture. No science nor art was developed; no new industry or even trade sprang up; the political unity, which religious enthusiasm and the Prophet had created, crumbled away into the old manifold tribal divisions. And even the Arabian empires on foreign soil and with a mixed population produced no civilisations which could be compared with those of Hamitic or Indo-European growth. They became the medium through Islam, for the communication to the West of a knowledge of ancient philosophy and natural science, without making any independent progress in them. The Jews scattered in the West have often played a similar part in appropriating to themselves the attainments of others and then passing them on. And as among the latter, as a general rule, their peculiar character, their Judaism in religion and morals consequently fell to the ground, so also did the genuine Arabian character vanish among the former. And if, on the other hand, in the

No progress in  
Art, Science, or  
Learning,  
through Islam.

foreign empires founded by the Arabs—as, for instance, in Spain—lyric poetry shot forth its most luxuriant blossoms, we must not deny in it the existence of purely Semitic talent. They are less original in their tales of adventure, like the “*Thousand and One Nights*.” Beyond the range of old Arabian genius the Arabs became creative only in architecture: in it they invented a new style. Yet it needs more exact investigation to decide how far in this department also the appropriation of foreign ideas and the influence of artists of foreign nationality extended. Thus the minaret appears to have been suggested by the terrace-towers of Mesopotamia, just in the same way that Indian materials are made use of in the “*Arabian Nights*.”

**The Ancient  
Hebrews.**

Not more highly endowed, with respect to all the above-named branches of civilisation and culture, were the Hebrew tribes at the time when we see them taking possession of the land of Canaan. For the most part, indeed, they pass at once in the conquered country from a nomadic to an agricultural life, but it was their new home itself in a measure that necessitated this transition. For they succeeded in the possession of the land a civilised people; and the fruits which the Israelite spies brought back testified as well to the fruitfulness of the country as to the civilisation of its inhabitants. Even the towns—not excepting Jerusalem itself—were acquired by the children of Israel from the Canaanites. The city of the Jebusites became the holy city of David. But even their royal government the Israelites did not devise for themselves. The purely Semitic polity—if it were not rather the very reverse of a polity—we see in the time of the Judges. The Arabs of the desert were able to remain with their various tribes in this free and independent condition: Israel, begirt by mighty nations, was obliged to become a monarchy. But the people know that in this they are merely imitating the neighbouring nations, that is to say, Hamites like the Phœnicians, or Hamitised Semites like the Moabites. And the voice of God comes to the Prophet, saying that this desire of the people for a king is equivalent to a rejection of God.<sup>1</sup> If then

<sup>1</sup> Compare the very remarkable eighth chapter of 1 Samuel.

sovereignty in Israel is of Hamitic origin, we need not wonder that the Temple of God also was built by Phœnician artisans. Similarly, more careful investigation has already in part shown, and will yet show more fully, that many, if not most, of the ceremonial and political institutions of the nation were borrowed from the Egyptians, the Phœnicians, or the Mesopotamians, and consequently from Hamitic peoples. Here I am referring not only to the Hebrew system of weights and measures, or to the calendar, but also to the Ark of the Covenant and the Cherubim. It is very wonderful that the most remarkable nation in the world should have proved itself so utterly dependent in regard to all these forms and institutions. We do not here speak of the peculiar spirit which gave life to these forms, of the significance which the kingly form of government, though borrowed from the Hamites, obtained in its bearing upon the religious development of the nation, of the God whom Israel worshipped in the Temple. Putting out of sight the religion of Israel, this nation also has not bestowed upon the world any memorable advance in civilisation. After the government by kings and the Temple had done their work, they were broken in pieces, as if they did not properly belong to the people; nay further, the nation was finally deprived even of its country and its very language. And as the Old Testament had formerly been written in the language of Canaan,<sup>1</sup> so the New Testament, the greatest work of Israel, was composed in Greek. Since then, Israel, scattered throughout all the world, speaks the languages of the Gentiles, and shares in their various forms of civilisation. A Philo becomes a Greek philosopher, a Maimonides a scholastic one, a Moses Mendelssohn a popular philosopher. The peculiar connexion of Indo-European philosophy with Jewish theology perhaps gives to their works a special significance. But none of these Jewish philosophers has opened up fresh paths to Indo-European science. Spinoza alone forms somewhat of an exception. He has given to Indo-European Pantheism a canonical form and expression which may be compared to that

<sup>1</sup> Referring to the idea that the Hebrew language was really of *Hamitic* origin. We have previously made some remarks on this theory.—W.S.C.T.



which the writers of the New Testament gave to Christianity. Consequently, kindred spirits that wish to unite, as he does, a particular Semitic religious character with Pantheism, gladly turn to him. In other respects there is coupled with Spinoza's Pantheism a Semitic stiffness and inflexibility also, which permits men indeed to turn back to him, but does not admit of a development from him and of his system.

Semitic genius  
not creative. However great may be the share which modern Jews have taken, and are taking, in the art and science of the Indo-Europeans at the present time, and however brilliant their success among their contemporaries, yet in no case is their part a truly creative and inventive one. However ingenious their appropriation and application of what has been produced, however effective may be their employment of what already exists, the pulsation of genius is lacking. If the demi-gods Bach and Händel, Mozart and Beethoven, have created something, a man of striking talent like Felix Mendelssohn can also accomplish what the multitude is unable to distinguish from those creations of genius. Yet it remains true that, as Richard Wagner affirms, what has been produced by hard labour in the sweat of men's brows during hundreds of years, the Jewish banker, by means of a clever manipulation of the Exchange, has brought into his own hands; what has been gained by the drudgery of genius, the Jewish *virtuoso* knows how most skilfully and cunningly to turn to account. And whoever is able to look into the mystery of genius, and especially into its intimate connexion with the mind and the life-blood of his nation, will readily admit that it is inconceivable that a Jew should become an Indo-European genius. Heine's wretched jokes at the end of his Poems, and the whole of Offenbach's music, betray plainly enough the wide gulf which yawns between Modern Judaism and true Indo-European life.

What a wonderful contrast this fact presents to our view when, compared with the other, viz., that our Christian Religion originated among this very people! In Christianity, and especially in the national reform which it received through the German Reformation, we have the fountain of

health for our nation. In Neo-Judaism we see one of the most dangerous enemies that poison the springs of our national life.

Let us, however, return to the Semites of antiquity. We have been obliged to disclaim for the Semites such endowments and achievements in civilisation as fell **Semitic Religion.** to the lot of the Hamites and Indo-Europeans. And yet they possessed something on account of which they occupy a position far superior to that of the descendants of Ham and Japheth, that is to say *Religion*. From the Semites have originated the three great religions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islám. The holy places, Jerusalem, Sinai, and Mecca, lie only a few days' journey from one another.

Let us then, in the first place, consider the people of Israel. However far we go back in their history, we ever find them **Israelite Monotheism.** possessing the fundamental traits of *one* faith and of *one* religion. There is but *One* God Who created Heaven and Earth. Though His works are manifold—the stars of heaven, the plants of the earth, and the multitudes of men—He, as the Almighty Creator, can only be *One*, who shares with none other His power, which is infinite, and His Majesty, which is supreme. For His Nature is *Holiness*. It is this knowledge of God, this religious experience, by which Israel is distinguished from all other nations of the earth. But what is meant by that mighty word *Holiness*? It means that God, the LORD (Jehovah), is exalted above everything that pertains to the Universe, whether it be in heaven above, or here upon earth, or under the earth. This exaltation, however, is not merely a graded or a relative, but an absolute one. God and the world are essentially different, because God is the Creator and the world His creation. Thus it is maintained, in opposition to every kind of Hamitism, that generative and productive life, as it manifests itself especially in the world of animals and of men—this mysterious seeking and finding of itself, in which Nature is ever being renewed—is neither the Deity nor the life of the Deity. Nor moreover is GOD the highest and most ideal thing which Nature presents to our sight. When



the rays of celestial light gilded the clouds of the sky, then the Indo-Europeans thought that they beheld a revelation of the Nature of God. And in their minds were imagined bright and shining figures, the highest ideals which human imagination and the flight of fancy can behold; and these seemed to them to be Divine.

**GOD exalted far above Nature.** With the Hebrew, however, it was an axiom that even the most beautiful thing which Nature shows us, and the noblest which we can conceive of, is not GOD. Exalted above all Nature and the imagination of all men, GOD can condescend to enter only into the heart of a man when by faith it raises itself above Nature. This revelation of the *Holy* GOD alone satisfies the deepest longings of the human soul, created in the image of GOD, which can find no rest<sup>1</sup> even in the most glorious objects of Nature, but rests only in Him who is exalted above all Nature. This is the GOD Who neither slumbereth nor sleepeth, though everything in Nature goes to rest; Who is neither born nor can die; Who also has not, like the light, to struggle for the victory with darkness. Exalted above light and darkness, He calls both of them His servants that He has created. From the *Holiness* of GOD arose in the mind of the Hebrew the thought that GOD created the world, a thought which has ever remained foreign to the Gentiles. This thought was not, however, the first in the perception of the Hebrew. The source of the Religion of the Old Testament is the religious experience of the *Holiness* of GOD. This is a matter that concerns itself with the heart, and by the way of the heart, or of the religious experience, the unphilosophical Hebrews attained to those grand thoughts which afterwards drove all heathen philosophy from the field.

Now the mysteriousness of this GOD lies precisely in His concerning Himself with this poor human heart. Because He is so highly exalted that even the heavens cannot contain Him, and the very light is but an image of His glory,—for this very reason is He able to stoop so low. For the Hebrew, in his

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. St. Augustine's grand address to God: "Thou hast created us for Thyself, and restless is our heart until it rest in Thee." (Aug. Conf. I., i.). —W. S. C. T.

faith in GOD, anticipated and already realised the mystery that the highest power and exaltation does not exist without humility, and that holiness cannot be without grace and mercy. Holy is GOD, the LORD, in the moral sense of the word, for there is no sin in Him; the root of all sin, however, is self-seeking and self-love. Now in this way, by this nature of His which exalts Him above every creature, GOD is brought down again to them that call upon Him. As the Psalmist expresses it, "The LORD is high, and hath respect unto the lowly."<sup>1</sup> This indeed does not mean that He has respect unto him *in spite* of His own greatness, but that *because* of His exaltation

Faith and Prayer. He hath respect unto the lowly. The religion of the Hebrews is the religion of faith and prayer.

All pagans wish to make their gods evident to the outward senses. This led the Egyptian to bring his deity near him in the form of an animal; the Persian beheld the object of his worship in the light or in fire; the Greek in the ideal figures which the artist created. Above all this the Hebrew soared in his belief in the invisible GOD and Creator of the universe. But this same GOD is to him not a GOD afar off and unapproachable, but, on the contrary, as the Almighty and the Omnipresent, He is near him, and as the All-Merciful He hearkens to his cry. Nay, the Almighty allows Himself to be vanquished through prayer. Thus Abraham intercedes for Sodom and Gomorrah. Thus Jacob again wrestles with GOD in prayer, and obtains for himself and his descendants the name of Israel, that is "Wrestler with GOD." For among this people that which precedes all struggles and victories for GOD in the world and over the world is always a wrestling in prayer with GOD, which ends in this, "I will not let Thee go except Thou bless me."<sup>2</sup> No one, however, can recognise the character and history of this wonderful nation who has himself no experience of prayer. For only one who has experienced it can understand that every wrestling with GOD in prayer is at the same time a victory over the natural man. That grand account of Jacob's struggle expresses this by saying

<sup>1</sup> Ps. cxxxviii., 6.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. xxii. 26.

that, as victor, but halting upon his thigh, Jacob left the field of contest. It is an evidence of the veracity of Old Testament history that it does not represent even the greatest Hebrew heroes, not perfect. heroes of its nation as holy men. How significant in this respect is the difference between Holy Scripture and not only Hindû Brâhmanical tales, but also Romish legends of the saints! Thus, even the Patriarch Jacob is a crafty Semite, quite prepared to cheat if necessary; in several of his traits of character not unlike an Ulysses. This is his condition as a natural man. But he is, or rather he becomes, quite another man. In that struggle with GOD the natural man is broken in pieces, and it becomes clear that, as the Psalmist expresses it, the LORD "delighteth not in the strength of the horse: He taketh no pleasure in the legs of a man. The LORD taketh pleasure in them that fear Him, in those that hope in His mercy."<sup>1</sup> The gods of the Greeks delight in the artifices of Ulysses; and the god who hates him is himself a partisan. In opposition to sinful Jacob stands the holy GOD, and allows him to receive the punishment of his deeds. When, however, the patriarch suffers his trust in his own skill and power to be broken, and trusts wholly in that GOD Who manifests Himself to his conscience as the Holy One, then he becomes one of his nation's prototypes.

It is true that the appellation of the "Holy One" is in Genesis not yet to be found. The giving of the Law from Sinai for the first time brings forward the statement and the deduction from it, "Be ye holy, for I am holy."<sup>2</sup> But even before that the nature of the GOD of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, is Holiness, only that it appears merely through His actions, not being expressed in words. In contrast to the gods of the Hamites, GOD manifests himself as the Holy One. The former are the gods of Nature, that is of generation and of death. The GOD of Abraham allows the ancestor of Israel to live in childless wedlock; and when all natural hope fails, a son and heir is born to him through the promise of GOD the Almighty, Who is exalted above Nature. The object of the

<sup>1</sup> Ps. cxlvii., 10, 11.<sup>2</sup> Lev. xi., 44; xix., 2 (cf. Ex. xxviii., 36).

narration of the offering up of Isaac, however, is that Abraham and his descendants might learn the difference between their holy GOD and the gods of the Hamites. These, according to the character of Moloch, demanded the death of the most dearly-beloved children. The GOD of Abraham also demands the surrender of the man with all that he is and has, but the offering is to be in spirit and in holiness. Ham's deity is the deity of lust, and therefore of death also. Israel must die to his sin and live unto his GOD.

**GOD the GOD of Revelation.** Now, if the GOD of Abraham is a GOD of *Holiness*, we must never forget that He is also the GOD of *Revelation*. That is to say, while the gods of the heathen are aspects of Nature, founded upon experiences of nature-life (among the Hamites aspects of the real life of Nature, among the Indo-Europeans those of the ideal life of the spirit and of Nature), the Almighty God, Whose holy Being, exalted above Nature, does not enter into the thought of the heart of the natural man, has of His grace and mercy condescended to commune with Abraham and Israel, and has made a covenant with them. He wishes to be their GOD, and they are to be His people. He wishes to make His will known to them, and they ought ever more and more to transform their natural and sinful being into His holiness. And when they shall have attained to the aim which is set before them, and when the times of the Gentiles shall have been fulfilled, then shall the salvation of the God of Abraham—Who is at the same time the GOD of all the heathen and of all the world—shine forth from Israel and fill the whole world. GOD has not, however, from the beginning made known the fulness of His nature.

This very fact is an evidence of the truth of such a revelation. While among the Hamites, as well as the Indo-Europeans, a deterioration of their religions is to be noticed; while (especially among the latter), a constant consumption and squandering of their inheritance in ideals may be perceived, Israel, on the contrary, the son of GOD, during a long period of training, rises ever higher and higher—from Abraham to Moses, from Moses to David, then to the

Prophets, and finally to the glorious liberty of the children of GOD through the revelation in Jesus Christ. The GOD who thus deals with Israel is the GOD of the History of Salvation; as such he is called Jehovah. The heathen hold once for all as their religious possession whatever of Divine life and Divine glory GOD the Creator has expended on the Universe, or has impressed upon it. Beyond this, no Divine revelation has been vouchsafed to them. With that possession and heritage of theirs they play fast and loose: they consume it. Israel, on the contrary, knows itself to be in covenant with the Living GOD. GOD speaks to and deals with Israel, and accompanies His chosen people through all the perils of their history, so that this nation can never become bereft of hope. For in the times of the very deepest need into which Israel is led, there arise the preachers of hope—GOD'S messengers—the prophets. When Israel appeared to be lost in the Hamitism of Egypt, Moses was called of GOD. In the time of the Babylonian captivity, prophecy shot forth its fullest bloom. And when Israel's state, city, and temple, were trodden down by the Romans, then occurs the revelation of Christianity to all the world, and does not fail to utter the hope—nay, more—the sure prophecy, that for Israel, when converted, there is still reserved a glorious mission.

Let us sum up the character of the GOD of  
GOD the GOD  
of Holiness and  
of Revelation. the Old Testament, and thereby the character of  
the Old Testament religion. GOD is the GOD of  
Holiness and of Revelation. The one does not exist without the  
other; and, indeed, the Revelation of GOD is based upon His  
*Holiness*. For inasmuch as GOD is exalted above the whole  
of Nature, He is on this very account the true Goodness, the  
Mercy and Grace that cannot and will not withdraw from His  
creatures. Inasmuch as GOD is unapproachable and incom-  
prehensible to sinful men, on that very account He proves  
Himself to be the GOD of LOVE and Faithfulness, the GOD  
of the History of Redemption, Who cannot leave sinful man  
to himself and to eternal death. This deep connexion  
between holiness and mercy is, perhaps, most clearly expressed

in the ancient Divine utterance: "The LORD, the LORD, a GOD full of compassion and graciousness, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy and truth; keeping mercy for thousands; forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin; and that will by no means clear (the guilty); visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation."<sup>1</sup>

Now, the revelation of such a GOD bears with it the evidence of its truth. He who has experienced it needs no further proof. To the man who has experienced none of this no proof is possible. To the character of this GOD of holiness and grace, however, the attitude of the human soul naturally corresponds. It can respond to GOD only with a love united with fear and trembling. It is the soul's soaring aloft to the Most High; and it can therefore take place only in the deepest humility. It is a captivating of the heart, which can be compared only with the first pure and chaste love of youth, when as yet the flesh does not assert itself but the ideal, and illumines the man as well as the whole world around. Then an inextinguishable longing ever accompanies the deepest awe of the pure and unapproachable in the beloved being; the deepest feeling of personal unworthiness; and yet the other feeling, too, "I will not let Thee go, except Thou bless me."<sup>2</sup> Thus, in the religion of the Hebrew, the thirst for GOD, as when the Psalmist says, "As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after Thee, O GOD. My soul thirsteth for GOD, for the Living GOD,"<sup>3</sup> and the blessedness of life in GOD, "The LORD is my shepherd, I shall not want,"<sup>4</sup> are pervaded by the most overwhelming feeling of sin and unworthiness. "How then can man be just with God? Or how can he be clean that is born of a woman? Behold, even the moon hath no brightness, and the stars are not pure in His sight: how much less man, that is a worm! and the son of man, which is a worm!"<sup>5</sup> Therefore, the grand ninetieth psalm says, "For we are consumed in Thine anger, and in Thy wrath are we troubled. Thou hast

<sup>1</sup> Ex. xxxiv., 6, 7.<sup>2</sup> Gen. xxxii., 26.<sup>3</sup> Ps. xlii., 1, 2.<sup>4</sup> Ps. xxiii., 1.<sup>5</sup> Job xxv., 4-6.



set our iniquities before Thee, our secret sins in the light of Thy countenance."<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly the religion of the Hebrew is always merely an acknowledgment of Man, and at the same time a denial of him; a denial of Man when sinning and walking in his own ways, but an assertion of Man's blessedness when he is in union with the Holy GOD. In this, however, lies the proof of its truth. For it shows itself to be not a product of the natural heart of Man, unable to make the heart better and able only to leave it in its sinful state, but on the contrary it breaks the heart in which it dwells. In as far as the GOD of the Old Testament changes the natural mind of Man in accordance with His own Holiness, He clearly reveals himself as the Creator of the human soul, while the heathen deities quite as clearly show themselves to be creatures of Man's creation.

#### *THE CONNEXION BETWEEN ISRAEL AND OTHER SEMITIC NATIONS.*

Finally, let us look at the connexion between the people of Israel and the great family of the Semites. While we must presume that this family was, in very early times, distinguished from the Japhethites and the Hamites by their acknowledgment of the true and super-mundane GOD, yet the more the nations of the Semites extended and multiplied, the more did the circle of those who professed belief in the true God gradually lessen. The family of Terah and the person of Abraham, however, did not stand perfectly alone. Perhaps it was so in Babylonia, but in Canaan Abraham found the family of Melchizedek still preserving the Semitic tradition. For it is self-evident that the Priest-King must have had a community dependent upon him. This tribe, under Melchizedek, King of Salem, worshipped the GOD of Shem under the name *El 'Elyôn*, that is, "the GOD Who is on high," or "is exalted above the world." The import of this name is explicitly given by the addition of the words "Possessor (or Maker) of Heaven

---

<sup>1</sup> Ps. xc., 7, 8.



and Earth."<sup>1</sup> Thus we still find here a remnant of Semitism in the midst of a Canaanite population.

That Melchizedek did not stand quite alone in his confession of the One GOD, the story of Abimelech, King of Gerar, shows.<sup>2</sup> It was chiefly in the family of Terah, however, that the worship of the GOD of Shem had maintained itself. In Joshua xxiv., 2, it is said that Terah, the father of Abraham and of Nahor, served other Gods beyond the River (Euphrates), but it is utterly without foundation to conclude from this that Abraham passed from the general Polytheism of the nations to Monotheism. On the contrary, a comparison of Gen. xxxi., 19, 30, 53, gives the true interpretation of the above passage. Here Laban, the representative of that branch of the Terahite family which had remained in Mesopotamia, clearly distinguishes between the GOD of Abraham and the God of Nahor, the GOD of their father (that is, the GOD of Shem) on the one side, and his own gods, the Teraphim, on the other. The latter are evidently local and family gods. And the transition to Polytheism on the part of the monotheistic Semites consisted therefore in this, that Transition to Polytheism of some Semitic tribes. though they held fast to the GOD of their race, they yet adopted, in addition, the worship of the gods of the country as secondary mediating deities. This state of transition might last for a very long time, however; so that any subsequent reformation always appealed to the primitive monotheistic consciousness of the people. Muhammad found a similar state of affairs with regard to religion prevalent among his countrymen.

It is nevertheless certain, with reference to the old Semitic religion, that it could not maintain itself against the Hamitism which pressed upon it from all sides, especially against the mighty power of its civilisation, and that it must have disappeared had it not been for the intervention of the Eternal GOD. This is true not only of the time of Abraham, however; it holds good of the time of Moses as well as of that of Elijah. The religion of Shem is a growing one; its future depends on

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xiv., 18, 19.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. xx.

the progressive Revelation of GOD. While Ham and Japheth are left to themselves, GOD cannot leave Shem, whom He has chosen for Himself. Now this progressive revelation is made through prophets. GOD does not, however, select the prophets from Hamites or Japhethites, but, on the contrary, from the Semites. To Abraham, GOD is the GOD of Shem; to Moses and the Israelites He is the GOD of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. GOD is always the GOD of history and tradition.<sup>1</sup> Each new revelation connects itself with and is in harmony with the Tradition.<sup>2</sup> Thus the whole History of Redemption runs on through a series of elections connected with one another. Scripture knows of an election of the Sethites from the family of Adam, of Noah from the Sethites, of Shem from the family of Noah, of Abraham, of Israel or Jacob through his separation from Edom. But even then this system of election has not reached its termination. From the Twelve Tribes of Israel, Judah and Benjamin (the southern kingdom) were separated; the northern kingdom disappears and is lost in heathenism, just as so many Semitic tribes had been.

Now what does this long development, this repetition of GOD's elections, mean other than this, that GOD is rearing GOD's own people. a people for His own peculiar possession out of the natural human race, and that too by means of a training which does not do violence to Nature? From this people was afterwards to proceed in fulness of time salvation for the whole world, and members of it were to become the priests, prophets and intermediaries of this salvation.

Now, while GOD thus makes an election from the members of a family, from the nations of one race, He nevertheless does not deprive those that go their own ways of what they already have. Let us think of the parables of the Prodigal Son,<sup>3</sup> and of the discontented labourers in the vineyard.<sup>4</sup> The former takes his share of the inheritance, the latter take with them the wages they have earned. And now their fates may greatly vary. Some may quickly squander their heritage,

<sup>1</sup> Ex. iii., 6, 15, and vi. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Ex. iii., 13, 14.

<sup>3</sup> Luke xv., 11 *sqq.*  
Matt. xx., 1—16.

others may for a considerable time use and even increase it; yet the inheritance does not last for ever, for it was gained by guilt.

Let us apply this parable to the various tribes of Semites. Many of them wasted their inheritance quickly enough in the dwellings of Ham. It happened otherwise with regard to the Semitic tribes in *Arabia*. We must here distinguish between different immigrations. The Joktanite Arabs formed the basis of the population; the Ishmaelite and Keturaean tribes followed.<sup>1</sup> In the South of Arabia, where the Sabæan and other Cushite tribes had established Hamite kingdoms and forms of civilisation, the Joktanites also fell into Hamitism. It was otherwise in Central and Northern Arabia. Here Semitism was preserved more pure, not merely because of its natural separation from the Hamitic kingdoms and the poverty of the land, but chiefly through the influence of new immigrations of Ishmaelite and Keturaean Arabs. Among these it seems that the Ishmaelites exercised a predominant influence in favour of Semitism. Only in this way can we understand the peculiar regard felt for the Arabian patriarch Ishmael, and indeed the definite prophecy in Genesis of the future greatness of his descendants. Ishmael received an inheritance not only from Shem but also from Abraham. Moreover, this is probably indicated by the tradition of the Hebrews, which represents Ishmael as well as Isaac as taking part in the burial of their father Abraham.<sup>2</sup>

**Arabic Monotheism.** Arabian Monotheism, the religion of Allâh, goes back to Shem and Abraham. This is proved by the Divine names. The forms *Baal* and *Moloch*, so characteristic of Hamitism, found no admittance among the Arabs. On the contrary, from *Elôah* is derived the Hebrew name *Elôhim* as well as the Arabic *Allâh*.<sup>3</sup> An investigation of the most ancient history of the Arabs is, indeed, attended with its

<sup>1</sup> Gen. x., 25. *sqq.*; xxv., 1 *sqq.*

<sup>2</sup> Gen. xxv., 9.

<sup>3</sup> *Allâh* is a contraction for *al-ilâh*, "the God"; and the latter word *ilâh* is the same philologically as the Het. *Elôah*, of which *Elôhim* is the plural.—W. S. C. T.

peculiar difficulties owing to the lack of memoirs. We have neither an ancient indigenous literature, such as the Hebrew nation possesses (for the literature of the Arabs begins<sup>1</sup> only with Muḥammad); nor do we meet with at all copious accounts given by foreign writers. Finally, the statements of Muḥammadan historians must be discounted through the circumstance that they date back Islāmic conceptions of GOD to the ancient times of their people.

With reference, however, to the fact that the Arabs were taken but little notice of by classical writers, in this respect it happened to them just as to the people of Israel. Although a Herodotus came into the confines of Palestine, yet with regard to this the most ancient nation of ancient times he has nothing whatever to relate. And what we learn about Israel from other classical writers is mostly erroneous, as, for example, when Jehovah is considered to be Bacchus, or the worship of GOD in Jerusalem to be the adoration of an ass!<sup>2</sup> If Monotheism prevailed among Arab tribes, it is quite conceivable that ancient writers may not have known anything about it, or that they reported what is totally inapplicable. No ancient writer ever penetrated directly into the heart of Arabia. If, therefore, Herodotus relates that the Arabs worshipped but two deities, Dionysus and Urania, the former under the name Orotāl, the latter under that of Alilāt,<sup>3</sup> this must mean only that the Arabs on the coast of the Mediterranean, which alone was visited by Herodotus, had adopted a Hamitic view of religion.

Without the supposition of a primitive religion of *Allāh*, the subsequent history of the Arabs would be unintelligible. Evidence of its existence is supplied by cuneiform<sup>4</sup> inscriptions dating from the seventh and eighth centuries before Christ, and Arabian historians are unanimous in declaring the same

<sup>1</sup> This is not quite correct; but the only Arabic literature of a date anterior to Muḥammad which has come down to us consists of a collection of short poems, the Mu'allaqāt.—W. S. C. T.

<sup>2</sup> Tacitus, "Hist." I. 3, 4.

<sup>3</sup> These words should, perhaps, be written *Allāh-ta'āla'* and *al-īlāt*, respectively, and would then mean, "God Most High," and "The Goddess."—W. S. C. T. (*vide* Herodotus III, 8).

<sup>4</sup> Lenormant, "Ancient Hist. of the East."

thing. Now if, on the other hand, there exist numerous facts which appear to prove their Polytheism, the apparent contradiction may be got rid of in the following way: In the course of time religious conditions were introduced among the ancient

Influence of local cults. Arabs, which may be compared with phenomena in Greek and Latin Christianity. There arose a great number of local cults, the object of which was not to abolish the worship of the One Supreme GOD, but only to introduce mediators with Him. By means of these idols men sought to gain for themselves the favour of the Most High GOD. Such local cults effected to some extent what was afterwards done by means of Muḥammad who destroyed them. With the recognition of Muḥammad as a "Prophet" there is coupled the acknowledgment of the "Prophet's" intercession with the One GOD as the only effectual mediation. Now as one does not in general deny the Monotheism of the Greek and Roman churches on account of their saint and image worship, as little can the manifold polytheistic habits of the ancient Arabs do away with their primitive Monotheism. The *cultus* of trees and stones was not originally idolatry, but was an old Semitic usage adopted for the purpose of marking the scenes of important events.<sup>1</sup> This usage led indeed to idolatry; yet the honour paid to the Ka'abah from that very early age proves that such forms of worship admit of being in some way or other, as it were, reconciled with Monotheism. Hero and star worship existed among the ancient Arabs, but ancestors and stars were regarded as mediators with the Deity, and as the announcers of His Will.

In conclusion, let us hear the opinion of Ash-Shahristānī, the Arabian historian, who may justly be taken as the best authority on the position of the ancient Arabs with reference to religion and civilisation. He says, "The Arabs of the pre-Islāmic period are divided, as regards religion, into various classes. Some denied the Creator, the Resurrection, and the return<sup>2</sup> of men to GOD, and asserted that Nature possesses in

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xxi., 33; xxviii., 18.

<sup>2</sup> That is, the return of the human spirit after the death of the body to its Creator for judgment.—W. S. C. T.

itself the power of bestowing life, but that Time destroys. Others believed in a Creator and a creation produced by Him out of nothing, but denied the Resurrection and the return to GOD. Others believed in a Creator, a creation, and some kind of return of men to GOD, but denied the Messengers of GOD, and worshipped false gods, concerning whom they believed that in the future life they would become their mediators with GOD: they undertook pilgrimages to them, brought them sacrifices and offerings, and approached them with religious rites and ceremonies: they deemed some things lawful and others forbidden. This was the religion of the great majority of the Arabs. Others again believed in a transmigration of souls," etc. Krehl adds, "In this, however, nearly all Arabian authors are agreed, that the descendants of Abraham from the very beginning professed the same Monotheistic religion as Abraham had done, and they ascribe the falling away from this Religion of Abraham solely to the influence of the devil."<sup>1</sup>

What the Arabian historian here describes as the religion of the first, second, and fourth classes of Arabs will be readily perceived to be a total or partial falling away into Hamitism.<sup>2</sup> We understand how Muhammad could come forward in the name of the supreme national God, the GOD of Abraham, Who had been merely cast into the background by the overgrowth of local cults. In this respect the appearance of Muhammed may be compared to the efforts of the Old Testament Prophets, when they rendered Jehovah, Who was still remembered in Israel, a living power, in opposition to the prevailing idolatry. As the work of Moses, however, would be historically unintelligible without pre-supposing a Religion of Abraham, or the labours of Elijah without the pre-supposition of the revelation at Sinai, so also would be the establishment of Islâm without the presumption of a Monotheistic basis. In opposition to the Hamitism which pressed upon it

<sup>1</sup> Krehl, "Ueber die Religion der vorislamischen Araber," p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the remarkable account which Arabian writers give of the first introduction of idolatry among the Arabs, Krehl, pp. 27, 28. Even then it meant nothing but a mediation with God Most High.—W. S. C. T.



from all sides, the ancient Monotheistic religion preserved a great part of the Arab tribes in their national strength, until fresh power, derived from Judaism and Christianity, came to them in Islām and fitted them to act the great part assigned them in the history of the world. In Islām, however, heathenism was by no means wholly subdued; on the contrary, Islām itself is merely the Religion of Revelation translated into *flesh*; it is, like Ishmael, the child of the bondwoman and not of the free.<sup>1</sup>

The religion of Muḥammad is throughout legal and slavish, and at the same time brutalised and brutalising, since both these things appeal to the natural man. It has borrowed deep and important truths from the Old as well as from the New Testament, but has mixed with them the lies of the natural heart of man. The light of Islām, being borrowed, will finally grow pale; the lie will swallow up the truth. Nevertheless, its Monotheism will be powerful in the world long after the last vestige of heathenism has disappeared. Before the Sun of Christianity the crescent pales. In comparison with the night of heathenism, it (Islām) is a wonderful light. For it is indeed the GOD of Shem, Who created heaven and earth, to Whom Islām bears witness; and we recognise in its prayers the language of the soul seeking its Creator, when we hear the Muezzin calling to prayer from the minaret, "*Allāhu akbar* (GOD is most great)! I confess there is no God but GOD! Come to prayer! Come to good works! Prayer is better than sleep! GOD is most great! There is no God but GOD!"<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xxi. 10.

<sup>2</sup> For the exact words, and the repetitions given at full length, with directions for raising and lowering the voice, *vide* *Mishkātū'l Masābih*, Bombay (Arabic) Ed., p. 55.—W. S. C. T.



## CHAPTER V.

### SHEM, HAM AND JAPHETH.

**W**E have hitherto been endeavouring to describe as exactly as possible, on the basis of their appearance in history, the peculiar characteristics of each of those three great families of nations by which the history of mankind has been, and is still being determined. If we wish to go still further back, and to inquire the ultimate origin of these great tendencies, historical investigations leave us without a reply. Perhaps, therefore, many will forbid us to inquire further than science permits us to see. But the human mind heeds not such a prohibition without good reason. Hardly will the careful inquirer be able to call a halt where his inquiry ends.

It is the same with the question of the origin of the human race. However incontestable may be the statement that science has no answer to give to this question, yet it should by no means be supposed that the human mind will allow itself to be deprived of the right of making that inquiry. Man has as much right to investigate his own ultimate origin as he has to do so regarding the existence of GOD. If he is refused an answer in one direction, he obtains it in another. If critical examination declares—as perhaps it is right in doing—that it has no reply to give, this simply means that one cannot procure one's clothes and shoes at the baker's. The human spirit lives as little merely by critical inquiry and its results as man lives by bread alone. Where science ends, there the sphere of faith begins. And where true faith is lacking, false science or superstition takes its place. Darwinism, with its theory of our descent from the ape, has abundantly illustrated this.

With regard to those great questions, the answering of which is a matter that may be accounted part of the "daily bread" of mankind, we are not left in perplexity. Where Indo-European science fails us, we must cling firmly to Israel, the Nation of Faith. In their Holy Scriptures, which, through GOD'S grace, are now ours, we have "a sure word of prophecy," which casts its bright light upon the obscurity of the past, as well as into the darkness of the future. It is, however, one of the grandest problems of the science which is conscious of its own limits to demonstrate the harmony of its results with the objects of faith.

It is only a very recent discovery of science that the great series of nations, of which the Hindûs form the eastern and the Teutons the western limits, have sprung from one primitive people, which had *one* language and *one* religion. It is only gradually being recognised that such nations as the Egyptians, the Mesopotamians, the Cushites of Ethiopia and Southern Arabia, and the Phœnicians, are similarly related to each other. Here the difference of language presents a great difficulty. But a comparison of their religions and forms of civilisation forces us to this conclusion. Now, what Indo-European science has only very lately proved, was recognised from the earliest times by the people of Israel. We refer to the marvellous tradition contained in what is known as the Genealogical Table of Nations in the tenth chapter of Genesis.

How is it that a comparatively modern nation has preserved for us this invaluable information? As this nation alone acknowledged the true GOD, so also it alone in those primitive times stood in a relation to mankind which was not founded on selfishness. Elsewhere all that the most ancient nations tell us of other sections of the human race consists of hardly anything but lists of conquered, subject, and tributary tribes. It is so with the Egyptians and the Assyrians. It is for self-glorification that these statements serve. For their commercial interests the Phœnicians, in all probability, collected<sup>1</sup> ethnographical

---

<sup>1</sup> The theory of the Phœnician origin of the tenth chapter of Genesis seems to be beset with difficulties, and has hardly anything in its favour. — W. S. C. T.

details. It was only at a very late date that curiosity caused a Herodotus to gather up information about barbarous nations. Among the Hebrews the motive was the thought of the salvation which was to go forth from them for the benefit of all mankind. It was a feeling of the noblest humanity, such as we find nowhere else, that preserved in Israel the recognition of the fact that all men are descended from *one* blood and destined for *one* salvation, which, however, is connected with the names of Shem and of Israel. We are, it is true, accustomed to compare with one another the exclusiveness of the Greek and that of the Hebrew, as expressed in the terms *Greek* and *Barbarian* on the one side, and by *Jew* and *Gentile* on the other. If the contrast between the nation possessed of art and science and leading a refined life on one hand, and foreigners on the other, was justifiable, how much more so was that made by the Hebrews through their consciousness of possessing the true

Contrast  
between Greek  
and Hebrew  
view.

religion among all the false ones! Yet one must not forget the difference in the manner of drawing such a contrast. While the Greeks asserted that they were autochthonous, and as far superior to the Barbarians in origin as the gods to men, the Hebrews, in spite of their consciousness of this distinction between them and the Gentiles, never suppressed the other truth that the Gentiles also were descended from the *same* blood as themselves, and that the latter were destined for the same end as they themselves were, viz., the worship of the only true GOD.

While Abraham is separated from the Gentiles, yet at the same time there is connected with him the promise of the blessing in which all the nations of the earth are to be blessed. This is wonderful. No nation shut itself up within itself more narrowly—and that, too, by the Divine command—in order that it might not be untrue to its peculiar vocation. And yet, even in this seclusion of its own, it ever remained conscious that it had a mission for the benefit of all mankind. Thus not only in Adam, but once again in Noah, the whole human race is summed up; in Noah, however, only in such a manner as to make mankind, his descendants, appear as a compendium of men in general. We must not see in Noah a mere repetition

of Adam. In Adam, the subject treated of is man by creation, in Noah, man by redemption. From Noah's posterity salvation is to come forth for the race of Adam.

The Genealogical Table of Nations, in Genesis x., is not intended to afford us a genealogical<sup>1</sup> and ethnological account of the whole human race for the purpose of scientific investigation. The Chinese, the Negroes, or the American Indians are not merely passed over in it, but they are not included at all in the list of Noah's descendants. But in the selection of the Noachic family of nations, and in what it tells us about them, this table presents to our view a representation of the development of all mankind from *one* blood, their separation into races, their varied organic relation to the Kingdom of GOD, and sets before us the bestowal of blessing and the adjudgment of curse in the history of the nations. But there are not—as one might fancy there were—merely two ways in which the history of nations has proceeded, viz., the way of faith (which Israel chose) and the way of apostasy, in which “the Gentiles” walk. The Genealogical Table and other passages connected with it teach us to recognise three directions in which the nations separated. Thus the heathen world, according to the Old Testament, is not one inseparable mass, but, on the contrary, it exhibits within itself two great contrasts, Ham and Japheth. If then we wish to become more thoroughly acquainted with the course of human history, we must not only bear in mind the difference between “Israel” and “the Gentiles,” but also that which exists between “Ham” and “Japheth.”

It is now pretty generally admitted that the Genealogical Table of Nations presents a peculiar combination of an ethnological with a geographical survey of the subject. A number of the names are not those of persons or nations, but are

---

<sup>1</sup> Professor Rawlinson, in his “Origin of Nations,” has dealt very thoroughly with the whole subject of the ethnology of ancient nations, and he proves most conclusively—as far as we have any evidence upon which to base a conclusion either way—the accuracy of the Genealogical Table in Gen. x., taken in its natural meaning.—W. S. C. T.

designations of countries; for example, Canaan ("the low-lands"), or Ophir, Havilah, etc. Not only does the transition from one meaning to the other take place quite commonly in history, but there is also included the idea of the close connexion between country and people, which, indeed, modern geography, since Karl Ritter's time, has scientifically demonstrated. The chief and highest importance of the table, however, is as we have already said, the religious one, or its relation to the Kingdom of GOD as manifested in history. Nations have been intermingled with one another, and others again have been destroyed. When nations and languages disappeared, their different forms of civilisation, as well as their religions, were able to survive them. Among our own nation—the German—do we not see a Semitic religion, and the culture of two nations which have passed away—the Greeks and the Romans—flourishing and prospering on a foreign soil and in a foreign language? Thus, our nation, as regards its religion, might be reckoned among the Semites.

The Genealogical Table takes no notice of the fact, which was patent to every Hebrew, that the Canaanites and Phœnicians spoke the same language as the Israelites, or rather, that the Hebrews spoke "the language of Canaan." Canaan is reckoned in the table among the sons of Ham. This was not the result of political hatred. Moreover, Israel warred most fiercely with Ammôn and Moab, or, again, with Edom; yet the Semitic descent of these nations was not on that account called into question. In whatever way the difficult problem may one day be solved, and the fact accounted for that, with the exception of Egypt and North Africa, we everywhere find Semitic languages in Hamitic lands and amid Hamitic forms of civilisation; the table will nevertheless be found to be correct in making the Canaanites sons of Ham. This is proved by the essential oneness of their religion and civilisation as we have depicted them above. Moreover, there is great weight in the statement of Manetho,<sup>1</sup> who, without regard to the difference of language, calls the Phœnicians

---

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Syncellus and Eusebius.

"brothers of the Egyptians." From Babylonia or the Persian Gulf the Canaanites brought with them to their new home a Hamitic religion and civilisation, as well as a Semitic language. How Hamitic tribes acquired a Semitic language, or Semitic tribes a Hamitic religion and civilisation, is for the most part concealed in the darkness of antiquity.

It may be regarded as an unquestionable fact that in the South of Arabia Joktanite Arabs overran the seats of an ancient Hamitic civilisation and stamped upon those regions their Semitic language, while, on the other hand, adopting *their* civilisation. Manifold proofs exist to indicate what a very great intermixture of nations has taken place in Mesopotamia from the most ancient times. Thus, Bêrôsus says that from the beginning there existed in that very region "a<sup>1</sup> great multitude of men of various nationalities." Æschylus<sup>2</sup> says the same; and the Book of Daniel again makes the royal edicts begin, "To you it is commanded, O peoples, nations and languages."<sup>3</sup> Thus, we must suppose that there occurred in Babylonia something similar to what took place in Yemen. Just as the Semitic tribe of Arphachshad had come to Babylonia, so there had reached Assyria the tribe of Semites which gave its name to the country. The fact that it belonged to the family of Shem must have for a long time been most clearly evident, for the Genealogical Table asserts it, notwithstanding the Hamitic civilisation and polity of this kingdom. We have already pointed out the characteristics of the Semitic religion in the domain of Assyrian mythology. We would merely add that the sublime narrative of the prophet Jonah, and his preaching in Nineveh, would be incomprehensible but for this connexion. On the other hand, the peculiar change undergone by the Semitic language spoken in Assyria—a change through which it lost its characteristic gutturals, and which hinders such a Semitic scholar as F. Hitzig<sup>4</sup> from acknowledging that Assyrian

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the fragments of Bêrôsus, quoted by F. Lenormant, "Essai de Commentaire," etc., p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Æschylus, "Persæ," rr. 52, 53. <sup>3</sup> Daniel, iii., 4; v., 19; vi., 26½; vii., 14.

<sup>4</sup> F. Hitzig, "Sprache und Sprachen Assyriens," Leipzig, 1871.



is a Semitic tongue—may be explained through the influence of an aboriginal population speaking quite a different language. Moreover, this scholar believes that he has discovered traces of an old Babylonian tongue, which we could regard as nothing else than as an Eastern branch of the Hamitic stock of languages.<sup>1</sup>

Early decline  
of the Hamitic  
family of  
languages.

On the whole we must admit that at an extraordinarily early period the Hamitic family of languages began to decline, and, in fact, to disappear in a very remarkable way. In Egypt alone did the language of Ham remain unimpaired till the close of antiquity, and it exists even in our own day in the Coptic tongue, still the ecclesiastical language of the Christian Church in Egypt. Relics of the West African languages of this family are preserved in the Berber tongue. Nearly everywhere else, however, even in early times, we find Semitic languages established in the domain of ancient Hamitism, just as among the Western Hamites also, the great Semitic tongue of modern times has gained the mastery by means of Islâm. The chief reason for this phenomenon may perhaps be found in the inferiority of the Hamitic languages in comparison with the Semitic. At the same time a nearer affinity between these two families of languages rendered the transition easy. For so much seems to be certain, that the Semitic and the Hamitic languages are much nearer to each other than are the Semitic and the Indo-European or Aryan. And in this fact we have a new example of how widely the religious and the philological standpoints often differ from each other. The Hebrews and the Canaanites speak the same language, but they stand in most clearly-marked contrast to each other in religious matters. The Semites and the Japhethites are closer to each other as regards religion and morality than the Semites and the Hamites are, while philologically and geographically they are farther apart. Without

---

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the solution of the problem of the second ancient language of Mesopotamia, in its two dialects, the Accadian and the Sumerian, will give us more light regarding these matters. Possibly it may finally be discovered to be a peculiar branch of the Hamitic family of languages although its connection with the Turanian group cannot be doubted.—W. S. C. T.



entering upon a nearer investigation of this linguistic phenomenon, we may perhaps continue to maintain that the Hamites and the Semites laid the foundations of their languages, so to speak, at an earlier period, and held on to them more tenaciously, while the development of the languages of the Japhethites varied more widely, in accordance with their more versatile nature.

However this may be, we maintain that the Genealogical Table of Nations and the Old Testament method of regarding the various races of men are not merely genealogical, still less are they linguistic. The matter is considered from a religio-historical point of view, which may originally have coincided with the genealogical and linguistic one, but which must necessarily in the course of historical development frequently contrast with the latter most decidedly. It belongs to the science of Universal History to bring these problems nearer to a solution. We confine ourselves to the question of *religion and civilisation viewed historically*.

### *TENDENCIES OF THREE FAMILIES OF SHEM, HAM AND JAPHETH.*

There are three great tendencies of spirit and mind with which we have to deal. Originally they were identified with three families of nations which possessed separate languages, countries, and forms of civilization. History blended these together both geographically and linguistically. This took place, in ancient times, more especially in the case of the Hamites and the Semites. In this struggle, languages and religions were interchanged. Hamites received Semitic languages, Semites borrowed Hamitic elements of civilisation, while they finally adhered to their own religion, as in the case of the Hebrews, or, together with their civilisation, gradually adopted the Hamitic religion also, as the Assyrians did.

What is conclusive, however, is neither the nature of the language nor certain elements of civilisation. It is the tendency of spirit and mind as it manifests itself in religion and morals.

We are now inquiring into the earliest origin of these various tendencies. We shall, in the next place, dwell on the *Names* of these races, and investigate their meaning. It will be in perfect accord with the nature of our documents if the signification of these names proves to be religious. People have, indeed, at one time, sought in them a geographical, and at another a physiological, significance. Thus *Ham* has been thought to denote the nations of the South or of the *hot* region. This explanation, however, does not harmonise with the names *Shem* and *Japheth*. Or, again, *Ham* has been explained as meaning *the dark coloured*, the Ethiopian, and *Japheth* as *the white and fair*.<sup>1</sup> By this system the name of *Shem* remains unexplained. By means of the explanation, however, which we now proceed to give, we think we can do justice, not only to all the three names, but also to the character of the Old Testament itself, regarded as a collection of religious records.

The object of the document which we are considering (Gen. x.) is not so much to call attention by these names to three individuals and to distinguish them from one another, as to point out the characteristics of three races and their respective natural tendencies. These are the "Sons of Shem, Ham, and Japheth." These names bear upon them a religious impress, just as do such phrases as "Sons of Abraham," or "Children of Israel." Here we must bear in mind that the Hebrews used this phrase to express the *disposition* of those spoken of; as, for example, in the terms "Sons of Belial"; or, again in the words of our Lord, "Sons of the Kingdom."<sup>2</sup>

Now, the meaning of the root *Hâm* is *hot*, or *burned*, or *to be black*. *Hemâh* is, moreover, the poetical name of the Sun, and *Hâm* is certainly an ancient appellation of the Sun or the Sun-god. In this sense the word *Hammu*, or *Khammu*, occurs in the Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions, and the word is found in the names of some very ancient kings of Mesopotamia,

<sup>1</sup> "Japheth"—*Fair, shining*. A white colour in men and women was regarded by the Hebrews and Arabs as beautiful (cf., "Song of Songs," I., 5 and 6; V., 10.)

<sup>2</sup> Matt. viii., 12.

as *Ur-Khammu*<sup>1</sup> and *Khammi-rabi*. So in the Old Testament, images of Baal, or sun-pillars, are called *Hammân*.<sup>2</sup> These were probably obelisks or conical stones, and they represented the sun's rays, and were at the same time the emblem of Priapus (the *linga*). For the root of this word *Hâm* expresses the glow of the sun as well as the ardour of sexual passion.<sup>3</sup> Finally, a remarkable myth makes *Hâm* out to be the holy fire worshipped by the Persians, the founder of magic, and the author of holy writings; he wished to be regarded as a God, and was destroyed by fire from heaven.<sup>4</sup>

In Ham we may recognise the chief deity worshipped by the Hamites, who is sometimes called Baal and sometimes Moloch, the God of the Sun and of carnal lust, but also of death: he is the Assyrian or Phœnician Hercules. If, then, a number of nations were called "Sons of Ham," the term meant, in that primitive language, the nations that were religiously and morally influenced by the Baal or Moloch religion. Of this, however, we shall speak further on.

Let us now turn to Japheth. In this name has long been rightly recognised the Titan Iapetos of the Grecian myth. Now, Iapetos is not only a Titan (that is, a god of an older order, like Cronos, with whom he is associated), but also, through Prometheus and Deucalion, the ancestor of the human race—that is, of the Greeks or their kindred Indo-European tribes. Finally, the character of Iapetos reappears in a very real and significant manner in that of his four sons, Atlas and Mênœtius, Promêtheus and Epimêtheus. We must, however, return to their father. As Iapetos, like Cronos, is an ancient deity, we do not hesitate to trace in this name the chief deity of the Indo-European race. Iapetos is the Dyaush-pitâ, Zeus-patêr, Diupiter, Jupiter, worshipped in India, Greece, and Rome. He is the God of Light and of the clear sky.<sup>5</sup> In perfect agreement with this interpretation is the statement of

<sup>1</sup> The proper reading of this name, however, is disputed.—W. S. C. T.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Chron. xxxiv., 4, compared with xiv., 5; Lev. xxvi., 30.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. xxx., 38, 39, compared with Ps. li., 7 (Heb.).

<sup>4</sup> Movers, "Die Phœnicier," vol. I., pp. 349, sqq.

<sup>5</sup> As far as we know, Buttmann ("Mythologus," vol. i., p. 224) was the first to connect Japhet and Iapetos with Jupiter.

Hesiod in the Theogony, that Iapetos is the son of Ouranos (Varuna) and Gæa (Prithivi), just as Indra is represented in the Vedas as a son of Dyaus and Mother Earth. In this way the later deity is in both cases sprung from the more ancient god. If, then, a certain series of nations were styled the "Sons of Japheth," the term implied that these nations had had their character moulded through their acceptance of the religion of Jupiter. But that with regard to the Indo-Europeans or Aryans, as well as the Hamites, no more comprehensive description can be conceived of than that we have found, will be clear from what we have already said as well as from the considerations that follow.

We now come to the third name. The explanation, "Sons of the Highlands," which regards *Shem* as derived from the root from which *Shāmāim*, "heaven," comes, is hardly worth mentioning. The Semites might possibly be called sons of the desert, but when have either Hebrews or Arabs been Highlanders? Nor can the expression "Sons of the Name" be regarded as equivalent to "men of name,"<sup>1</sup> which interpretation Knobel seeks to justify by referring to the Semitic Assyrians. This is by no means the view met with in the Old Testament, and in the Genealogical Table in particular. While this record points to the Hamite Nimrod as the first man of renown, it attaches so little importance to Asshur that it does not even enumerate his sons, for these are lost among the Hamites of Mesopotamia. We should rather inquire here also whether *Shēm* does not denote a Divine Being. Now, the idiom of the Old Testament shows us that we must here understand the GOD of Israel, the GOD of the Semites. By "Shēm" is meant the manifestation and the presence of the invisible GOD, who has chosen unto Himself the people of Israel and their fathers, and has bestowed upon them, in His Name, the knowledge of His nature as well as the experience of His power and goodness. Nor must we think that the chief thing, viz., the *name* of GOD, is here lacking; for

<sup>1</sup> Gen. vi., 4. (Heb.) rendered 'men of renown' in our English version.—W. S. C. T.

according to the view of the Israelites—and quite as certainly that of the ancient Semites also—this Name, unlike others, is not to be uttered without necessity. Traces of this idea are found among the Gentiles as well. It is well known that at a later time the Jews were expressly forbidden to pronounce the name of “Jehovah.” Significant, indeed, according to this view, is the passage<sup>1</sup> in which we are told that a man only half an Israelite strove in the camp and blasphemed “the Name.” Again, in place of pronouncing the word “Jehovah,” the Samaritans<sup>2</sup> substituted for it the word *Shimā* (= “the Name” or “the *Shēm*”), just as the Jews do the term *Adōnāi*, “My Lord.”

If, therefore, the Semites are called “Sons of the Name,” it means much the same as if they were entitled “Sons of the Revelation.” We also speak of “revelation” without adding anything more. By this term “revelation,” however, we must understand not merely one that is past and gone, but rather a living and abiding Presence. Therefore, a House may be built “for the name of Jehovah,” because in this House there is to be a special Divine Presence and Working.<sup>3</sup> “Sons of the Name” are accordingly men who know themselves to be guided in their lives and actions by the revelation and active presence of the only true and invisible GOD. We may affirm that no other name could more aptly describe the character of the Semites than does this.

Thus we see in the *Sons* of Ham, of Japheth, and of Shem, the nations which worshipped Moloch, the nations that adored Jupiter, and the nations which possessed the Revelation of GOD. In the Old Testament, however, nations are not unfrequently represented by their gods; thus, the Moabites are the People of Chemosh, the Ammonites are the People of Moloch,<sup>4</sup> and Israel is the People of Jehovah in the Song of Deborah.<sup>5</sup> Finally, in confirmation of what we have said above, we append the following important

The  
Worshippers of  
three Gods are  
mentioned.

<sup>1</sup> Lev. xxiv., 11; cf. Lev. xxiv., 16; Deut. xxviii., 58.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon s.v. *Shēm*. <sup>3</sup> I. Kings iii., 2; viii., 17.

<sup>4</sup> Numb. xxi., 29; Jer. xlviii., 46; xlix., 1.

<sup>5</sup> Judges v., 11; and also Ezek. xxxvi., 20. <sup>6</sup> Book iii., § 2.

tradition. In Moses of Chôrênê and the Sibylline Books there is an evidently very ancient account of the dispersion of mankind after the Flood. This, perhaps, dates back to the Chaldean Bêrôsus, as the Armenian historian derives it from "the sibyl of Bêrôsus." There we are told that "After the voyage of Xisuthros" (the Noah of Bêrôsus), "Zerovan, Titan, and Iapetosthês received dominion over the earth." Then there follows a story of the contest between these brothers, in which their sister Astlicia interposes as a peacemaker. In the Sibylline<sup>6</sup> books the brothers are called "Cronos, Titan, and Iapetos." Tertullian,<sup>1</sup> again, has "Saturn, Titan, Tamfetus." Lastly, in two other fragments there appears the names of "Cronos, Titan, and Promêtheus."<sup>2</sup> Now, amid much that is uncertain in these myths, this much seems clear, that an old (probably Babylonian) tradition saw in Shem, Ham, and Japheth, divine or mythological beings. Shem is called Cronos, or Saturn, or Zervân (Zarvâna-akarana, "infinite time" in old Persian). Ham and Japheth are Titans; the latter is, in fact, interchanged with Promêtheus; and Astlicia is probably Istar, the Mesopotamian Aphroditê.

The Old Testament, however, discloses to us the original character of these national tendencies, and that, too, not only by means of these names, which we have shown to be deeply significant, but also by mentioning two important facts, which, in a peculiar manner, supplement each other. One of these facts is connected with the privacy and mystery of family life in the time of Noah;<sup>3</sup> the other takes us back to the origin of the separation of nations from one another.<sup>4</sup> The former account traces the mutual separation of nations back to a predominantly moral distinction between them, the latter to an impious and profane undertaking. The two facts, however, stand in the closest relationship to each other. When Ham dishonours his father Noah, he dishonours Noah's GOD also; and, inasmuch as the nations separate from one another as regards religion, they do so in reference to morals

<sup>1</sup> *Ad Nationes*, 11., 12.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. ix., 20, *sqq.*

<sup>2</sup> Lenormant, *ut supra*, pp. 415 *sqq.*

<sup>4</sup> Gen. xi., 1, *sqq.*



as well. Whatever phenomenon becomes manifest in the parting asunder of the great masses of the population, is rooted and grounded in the circumstances of the descendance of Noah in patriarchal times.

Let us, in the next place, consider the event  
 Hamite attempt  
 at Universal  
 Monarchy. above referred to in the domain of national life.

In accordance with the historical fact that the formation of the first great states and the first great developments of civilisation belong to the Hamites, the Book of Genesis tells us that this peculiarity of the Hamites found its first and, indeed, its principal expression in the work undertaken by Noah's descendants in the Land of Shinar, that is in Mesopotamia,<sup>1</sup> and which resulted in both the confusion of tongues and the dispersion of the nations. We must regard the Hamites, the earliest possessors of that region, as leaders in that undertaking; and, if we compare the account given in Gen. x., 8, *sqq.* with Gen. xi., we shall see that Nimrod the Hamite was the founder of the most ancient kingdoms of Babylon and Nineveh. His aim was to establish a universal monarchy, in accordance with the idea of Ham, with all its delights and its glories, and, at the same time, with all the ungodliness and demoralisation which have ever been peculiar to it. The very apex of the Hamite monarchy, however, was the deification of humanity in the person of the Ruler of the world. This is referred to in what is the most important phrase in the account of the building of the Tower of Babel, a phrase which is nevertheless much misunderstood, viz., "Let us make us a Name."<sup>2</sup> We must here include in our conception the whole mass of the ideas and relations which Holy Scripture connects with the expression "Name" (Heb. *Shēm*). The Semites, wishing to be "Sons of the Name," resolved to place their whole life under the sole guidance and influence of the invisible but ever present holy GOD. In opposition to this, those Hamite leaders wished themselves to take the place of

<sup>1</sup> Shinar, called by the Assyrians, Sumér, was by no means coextensive with Mesopotamia, but denoted merely a part of the country near the Shatu'l 'Arab.—W. S. C. T.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. xi., 4.



the Deity, and to make it the aim and object of all their efforts to bring about, through human power and prudence, the unity and harmony of mankind, and to secure the attainment of happiness and the enjoyment of life. As a substitute for the union of mankind in the worship of the true GOD, those early demagogues and despots intended to offer the grand work of political unity, at which they aimed, in order to create a world-wide civilisation, to which the whole of Nature should be laid under tribute; a unity which was to find its visible expression in the building of a metropolis of the world, and a sanctuary for it. They did not wish to be without religion. Those ancient seducers of the people were not such fools as modern demagogues often show themselves to be. Man needs a religion. Thus there must needs be established a national sanctuary, the cathedral of their capital city, the summit of which might reach even unto heaven. But in this sanctuary all effort and toil, and, moreover, all forms of human enjoyment (and, therefore, humanity itself) were to receive their religious glorification.

**Formation of a State.** This was, indeed, a grand, nay, an extraordinary step in advance. The various members of the human race, who had hitherto lived in families and tribes under mutually independent tribal chiefs, were now about to pass on to the formation of a state. And the great Hamitic section of mankind, conscious of being endowed with civilisation, and of being qualified for a position of such dignity, hoped to become the ruling caste of a vast empire embracing all mankind. If, however, the Semites and the Japhethites would follow the guidance of the Hamites, they would enjoy all the advantages of a civilised life, and instead of their nomadic condition, they would find pleasure in agriculture, and in dwelling in cities, with their refinements and luxuries. Even at that early time the separation and dispersion of the children of Noah over the face of the earth might be apprehended.<sup>1</sup> The sons of Ham believed that they had found the means of averting this evil, and that it consisted in a civilised life in cities, together with

---

<sup>1</sup> Gen., xi., 4.

the political and religious organisation incident thereto. For, in place of the old patriarchal and tribal constitution, and of the simple worship of the invisible GOD, without temples, there was to come in a new political unity with a central government, and also a religious unity in a visible sanctuary. These tribes of nomads or hunters were, of course, entirely independent, and might disperse themselves over the whole world. No political bond, no religious connexion with a holy spot, an image of GOD and its religious cult, had hitherto bound mankind together.

It has been previously shown what kind of political unity, what kind of civilisation and religion the human race, thus united, would have had. With the great advantages of civilisation were coupled a frightful despotism and an abominable caricature of religion. Thus, since this unification of mankind in the land of Shinar, under the influence of the Sons of Ham, was not accomplished, the freedom and independence of the Japhethites and Semites were secured.

**Origin of Hamitism.** Finally, the Old Testament narrative, in a very significant manner, connects the origin of Hamitism with an event in the family life of Noah. Here it is self-evident that the names explained above indicate simply persons, sons of Noah. This, however, by no means refutes our interpretation; on the contrary, it only shews that the founders of the three families were themselves called after the names of the Gods of the various tribes, just as Iapetos or Promêtheus are at once Titans (that is to say, gods) and ancestors of the human race (that is, men). When Ham shews himself to be destitute of the sense of shame, he, as it were, inaugurates the Phallus-religion or cult of the *linga*. This was characteristic of the Hamites; for what modesty covered among Indo-Europeans and Semites was openly set up among the Hamitic nations as the symbol and the manifestation of the Deity. The Phœnician cult shewed this in the most simple and ready manner by placing a conical<sup>1</sup> stone as an image of the Deity in the most sacred part of their temples.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the *Yoni* and *Linga* worship of India.—W. S. C. T. \*

<sup>2</sup> Cf., with regard to Egypt, Plutarch, "de Isi et Osiride," cap. 18.

The Old Testament has for the most part to do with the contrast between the Hamites and the Semites; for Israel dwelt among the Sons of Ham, and from these came the temptation to fall away. Japheth had gone far away, and consequently we do not hear so precise an account of him. In the next place, according to the last-mentioned narrative, the ancestor of the Indo-Europeans appears to have been equally with Shem opposed to Ham's sacrilegious act. Now, although Japheth also has a share in GOD's blessing, yet he does not receive the blessing bestowed upon Shem. It is *Jehovah*, the GOD of the History of Redemption, who is blessed as the GOD of Shem; and it is *Elôhîm*, the GOD of Nature and the Creator, who "shall enlarge Japheth" upon the earth, until the latter shall again find a home "in the tents of Shem."<sup>1</sup> We are not expressly told the reason for this difference in the blessing.

The general view of the matter, taken in the Old as well as in the New Testament, does not, however, leave us in doubt about it. Japheth also is numbered among the lost sons; but with his inheritance he at the same time receives a blessing, just as Ham receives the curse. It is upon a religio-moral idealism, such as we have already endeavoured to describe, that GOD'S blessing rests, because that tendency of the spirit is derived from GOD, and is of a Divine nature. But Japheth did not take away this inheritance of his without guilt. The private traditions of the Japhethites give us more exact information about this. And here we return once more to the myth of Iapetos and his offspring.

By the name of Japheth, which Holy Scripture has adopted, our attention is clearly directed to the myth of Iapetos. Now it is evident that the fable about the sons of Iapetos among the Greeks occupies a place similar to that held by the history of the Fall as recorded in the Old Testament. Yet it is a characteristic point that this Fall should repeat itself in the race of Japheth. Shem is the man who is again accepted by God, and who lives in communion

Iapetos'  
guilt.

<sup>1</sup> Gen., ix., 26, 27.

with Him. Japheth is the fallen one; his descendants are represented by his four sons, Atlas and Mênœtius, Promêtheus and Epimêtheus. Mênœtius is the man of passion and defiance, and is called in the Theogony, "the Arrogant," whom therefore Jupiter casts into Erebus. Atlas is he who knows the depths of the sea, who, in the pride of knowledge, wished to explore "all things in heaven and under the earth"; as a punishment he was condemned to support the vault of the sky. The cunning Promêtheus again seeks to overreach GOD, either by defrauding the Deity of His offerings, or by stealing the sacred fire; as a punishment he is fastened to a rock, and an eagle every day eats his liver, which grows again during the night.<sup>1</sup> Lastly, Epimêtheus represents the sinner, considered as a fool, who, too late, discovers that sin leads to the destruction of the nation.

Now, all these characteristics are to be taken together and attributed to the human race in general, but especially to the Indo-European family. Among the Japhethites a Titanic attempt against the Deity took place through confidence in their own power and wisdom. What Man can receive only through Faith, because GOD is a free and a holy GOD, Japheth wished to acquire by the exercise of his own mental powers. Let us compare the myth of Faust with that of Promêtheus. Neither Promêtheus nor Faust is of a base nature; they are, on the contrary, representative of Indo-European idealism, and, therefore, not only our poets but our own hearts sympathise with them. But all their striving after the ideal is nevertheless connected with the self-love and pride of the natural man, which desires to do violence to GOD, or which sets at nought the commands of GOD, as Faust does with regard to Gretchen.

But punishment is not to be evaded. The assailants of heaven sink into darkness, those who call themselves "Sons of heaven and of light," have to support the vault of the sky,

---

<sup>1</sup> It is worthy of notice that the Promêtheus-myth is also found among the Ossetes, an Indo-European people of the Caucasus, where Æschylus locates the Titan. We have here to deal with a tradition common to the Indo-European race.

and to bear the wrath of GOD. Like him who was fastened to the rock, they reach no happy goal in all their struggles and their strivings; longing ever grows afresh, and yet it cannot be satisfied, just as Faust knows no hour to which he can say, "Tarry, thou art so fair."

We now return to the benediction uttered by Noah's blessing. Noah. Japheth is to possess the breadth of the earth, and with his science is to penetrate to the depths of the Universe, but in all this he will not find rest for his soul, nor will he attain the aim of all human life. That is to be found in the GOD who rules over Nature, and who has fixed His abode in the tents of Shem. If, then, Japheth longs for the peace of GOD, he must, some time or other, return to the tents of Shem. And the prophecy says that this will be so. Japheth's rich inheritance in idealistic wealth will be consumed, as was the substance of the Prodigal Son.<sup>1</sup> For all the gifts of GOD have an eternal permanence only when the receiver remains *in communion with* the Giver. Thus, Greece and Rome traded with their rich inheritance and gained interest upon it; the end was nevertheless ruin. Eternal life and eternal activity are apportioned only by the eternal GOD, Who in the fulness of time, when both Greeks and Romans had consumed their inheritance, caused the messengers of peace to go forth from the tents of Shem, in order to invite the nations afar off to the Great Supper.

It is otherwise with the Sons of Ham. They are not only lost, but cursed sons. For what Ham did to his father Noah, the Hamites wished to do to the Deity. In the religion of Ham we perceive an utter want of veneration on the part of Man for the Divine; they degrade the Deity to sexual life and to death, and, on the other hand, exalt man,—nay, even beasts—to the Throne of GOD. On this account Noah's prophecy contains nothing for them but servitude. Here we must bear in mind that it is to the *world-ruling* nations of the most ancient times that this prophecy was addressed. Their dominion was to have no permanence. It is not merely that

the descendants of Ham were to be in a state of slavery, but that all their civilisation, and their whole mission in history, is that of servitude. "One must regard the Hamitic race as the *culture-humus* on which the conquering races of the Semites and Indo-Europeans founded and established their empires."<sup>1</sup> This is in a special sense seen to be true in the case of the Canaanite division of the family, which had, like a gardener, to cultivate the Promised Land for Israel. And therefore, when at last, even for Ham, salvation shone forth from the tents of Shem, it was not Christianity and the liberty of the children of GOD which it proclaimed, but Islâm—the servile form of the religion of Shem. What still exists of Ham's offspring is, with few exceptions, subject to Islâm, and groans—as for example Egypt and Mesopotamia do—under the oppression of evil Muhammadan rulers. This must be so, until at last the Crescent also shall pale before the Sun of Christianity, and the last of Ham's descendants shall be converted to faith in David's Son.

---

<sup>1</sup> Baron von Eckstein, "Revue archéologique," Paris, 1874, p. 390.



## CHAPTER VI.

### THE RELATION BETWEEN HAM AND THE SEMITES AND JAPHETHITES OF THE EARLIEST TIMES.

**B**EFORE the Semites and the Indo-Europeans appeared upon the stage of History, the civilisation of the Hamites or Cushites had spread over a considerable portion of the ancient world. According to the Genealogical Table in Genesis x., Cush is the firstborn of Ham. This branch of the Hamitic family accordingly appears to have had a wider range, and to have been of more importance than the Egyptians or the Canaanites. The Cushites, or Ethiopians, according to the Genealogical Table, inhabited Abyssinia, South Arabia, and Mesopotamia. We have good reason to believe, however, that the Cushites extended much farther still towards the East. This is indicated by the very frequent occurrence of the word *Cush* in Central Asiatic names. In this place it will be sufficient to mention the *Hindū Kūsh*<sup>1</sup> (the Indian Caucasus), *Chusistān* (the ancient Susiana), *Kūshān* in Balūchistān, *Kūshikas*, a designation of the Indian Śūdras, and *Kūshān*, the name of the aborigines of Asia in Persian legends. Homer also knew that the Ethiopians dwelt in the regions of the rising<sup>2</sup>, as well as in those of the setting sun, that is to say, in Asia as well as in Africa. According to Strabo, who appeals to Ephorus as his authority, the whole

<sup>1</sup> But the word *Kūsh* here has a different derivation generally assigned to it, viz., the Persian *Kūshān*, "to kill."—W. S. C. T.

<sup>2</sup> *Odyss.* I., 23, 24.



of the southern coast of Asia and Africa must have been inhabited by Ethiopians. At a later date Herodotus knew of Ethiopians of the East serving in the Persian army along with Indians; and Eusebius relates that, in the time of the Egyptian king Amenophis III. (in the fourteenth century before Christ), an Ethiopian colony travelled from the Indus to the Nile.

The wide extent of this Hamitic civilisation is further confirmed by the numerous tales of the travels of Dionysus, Hercules, Memnon, Osiris, and Sesostris. At one time campaigns are denoted, at another the spread of civilisation. And although none but the account given of Sesostris rests upon a historical foundation, yet the other mythical persons also are representatives of that great period of Hamitic culture.

We shall speak of Dionysus later. His travels indicate in some degree the extreme Eastern limits of this civilisation. These were India and South Arabia; just as Hercules, the god of the Assyrio-Phœnician religion, reached the Western extremity at the Pillars called after him. Memnon, the Ethiopian, was regarded as the son of Aurora, and as ruler of these Eastern Ethiopians. Sepulchral monuments, the so-called *Memnonia*, were ascribed to him in many parts of Further Asia, in Susa, Ecbatana, Babylon, Phœnicia, Syria, Cyprus, Asia Minor, and Egypt. It has long since been pointed out that these *Memnonia* were nothing else than the sanctuaries of an ancient deity. We understand, however, from what has been said regarding the religion of the Hamites, why these sanctuaries might be correctly regarded as tombs.

Civilisation  
derived from  
Hamites

If such an ancient civilisation as that we have referred to existed prior to the development of that of the Semites and the Indo-Europeans, it would be exceedingly strange if the latter had not, in important particulars, been the outcome of the former. Only gradually do modern investigations lead us to perceive these relations. In a previous chapter we spoke, for example, of the Babylonian system of measures, coins, and weights, of which all current nations availed themselves, but on which we, in modern times, also—in part, at least—are dependent still. Another important

department has recently had clearer light cast upon it, that which concerns the migration of cultivated plants and domestic animals from Asia into Europe. When the Indo-European tribes entered the peninsulas of Southern Europe, they found those countries covered with the same kind of forests as are still to be seen to-day in Central Europe. Victor Hehn says that in ancient times "the summer foliage and the swelling contours of the northern vegetable world gradually gave way to a plastic, motionless, evergreen and dark-coloured vegetation, consisting of cypress, bays, fir trees, myrtle bushes, pomegranate trees, etc." Now, while Hehn terms this alteration by the hand of man of the entire flora of the northern shores of the Mediterranean a *Semitising* of those countries, we must rather name it a *Hamitising*, inasmuch as the most important of these plants were first cultivated in lands where a Hamitic civilisation prevailed. From the Hamites the Semites received them in the first instance, and afterwards the Indo-Europeans also did the same. The vine was first used by the Hamites, although its original home may have been the regions to the south of the Caspian Sea. The Hebrews found its cultivation carried on in Canaan. This is true of the fig tree also. The olive spread from Byblus and Gaza towards the west. The myrtle and the cypress, the pomegranate and the quince, passed over into Greece and Italy along with the worship of Hamitic deities,—the myrtle as the tree sacred to Aphrodité, the pomegranate and the quince as symbols of the worship of Aphrodité and Adonis. The horse, horned cattle, and the dog, were brought to Europe from their original home by the Indo-Europeans. The domestic cat came to them from Egypt, where the timid creature had been tamed through the honour and affection shown it. The tame dove likewise came from the Hamitic temples of Mylitta-Semiramis in Mesopotamia and Syria.

We have here mentioned only a few examples of the way in which civilisation passed over from Asia to Europe, and of these some evidently belong to a later period. But such a connexion already existed even in the earliest pre-historic times. This period remained in the memories of the Greeks and Latins as the age of Cronos or

Passage of  
civilisation  
from Asia to  
Europe.

Saturn. Saturn was regarded as the founder of cities; he taught agriculture, the grafting of trees, the rearing of bees, and the like. Among the Greeks Cronos appears as the father of Chiron, the centaur, the representative of the healing art. The era of Cronos was considered as the earliest as well as the Golden Age. The conception of a paradise-like condition of mankind was probably confounded with the remembrance of that great Hamitic civilisation. Although Cronos may have originally been a Greek god, as Saturn was a Latin one, yet he was certainly confounded with Baal-Moloch, the chief deity of the Hamites; and therefore these nations were right in tracing back to him what they had borrowed from Hamitic civilisation.

The ancients generally entitled the chief god of the Assyrian and Phœnician nations Cronos or Saturn. This is the god who was honoured by the sacrifice of children and by self-mutilation. Hence he appears in Hesiod's *Theogony* as emasculating his father, Ouranos, and devouring his own children. The origin of the institutions connected with Saturn is perhaps most clearly indicated in one of the best-known festivals, namely, that of the Saturnalia, or Cronia. The peculiar feature of this feast was, as is well-known, the equality of the slave with the freeman during its continuance. And therefore the fact has not been ignored that this festival, so popular in Italy especially, was the same as that which was celebrated in Babylon also, and which we have described above. And if in many districts of Greece this joyful day for the slaves was connected with the festivals of other deities, yet this fact by no means negatives its Hamitic origin. This was the case in Athens, for example, with reference to the Dionysia. But Hamitic traditions were associated with Dionysus, particularly among the Greeks.

If we now turn to the Greek nation in particular, that focus of Indo-European genius and of Indo-European civilisation, we find that all departments of Greek culture experienced numerous and important impulses from that of the Hamites. Of all the Western countries inhabited by Indo-Europeans, moreover, Greece lay most open to influences from Egypt, Phœnicia, and Asia Minor—the great bridge of countries, so to speak, connecting

*Influence of  
Hamites on  
the Greeks.*

Mesopotamia with the West. In this respect, Asia Minor is especially to be taken into consideration as the land which, having its coasts inhabited by Greeks, displayed in its interior a complete mixture of Hamitism and Japhethism. Among the Phrygians, for example, an Indo-European people, we find the most important element of their religion to be the great Mother of the gods, Cybelê, with her Atys,—who is also Baaltis-Aphroditê, with her Adônîs accommodated to Phrygian ideas. Here, in fact, we perceive an Indo-European people entirely Hamitised.

Throughout the whole of Asia Minor, however, the chief female deity of the Hamites was honoured in varying forms as goddess of Comana, Cybelê, or Artemis of Ephesus. She is the goddess who is seated on lions. Next to her comes Hercules-Sandan, worshipped in Tarsus, Nicæa and Sardis. Asia Minor, especially the eastern part of it, was full of male and female *hierodôles* or temple-slaves. The feast of Tabernacles was celebrated at Comana and other towns in a manner similar to that of its observance in Babylon. This would not have been possible had not the country been inhabited by Hamitic nations, or by tribes that had, in very early times, become Hamitised, like the Solymi in Cilicia, the Lydians in the western part of the interior, and the Carians on the western coast. The sovereignty exercised by the Assyrians over Asia Minor was probably only the conclusion of a very ancient connexion between that country and the great centres of Hamitic civilisation.

Let us begin with the religion of the Greeks. Hamitic  
Influence on  
Greek religion. In this several deities have been wholly taken over from the Hamites, while others, again, exhibit a mixture of Greek and Hamitic characteristics. To the former class belongs Aphroditê, the "Cyprian"<sup>1</sup> goddess; to the latter Hercules and Dionysus. Moreover, even the Hamitic goddess, in spite of her impure origin, became, through the ideal feelings of the Greeks, transformed into a pleasing and exalted conception,

<sup>1</sup> The Cyprians, from whom the Greeks borrowed the cult of the goddess, traced their worship of her to Ashkelon. Her grave also was pointed out in Cyprus, as that of Jove, in Crete.

fit for the society of the Olympian gods. What a process of idealisation has taken place in this may be seen in the goddess herself, and still more in the relation between the beautiful youth Erôs and his mother, Aphroditê. Erôs is none other than the son of the Hamitic goddess, who lives in incest with his mother. Greek taste, however, purified him from this infamy, and transformed him into the ideal of youthful beauty. The Greek was well aware of that loathsome connexion between mother and son, but he could not, like the Hamite, attribute to the deity anything of the kind. He ascribed it rather to Œdipus, the ill-fated son of Laius and Iocastê, in whom we recognise the Hamitic myth on Grecian soil. And again, Grecian poetry knew how to transform the family of Œdipus, that house of guilt and sorrow, into one of the grandest tragic archetypes of mankind, borne on through sin and guilt to pain and death.

Over and above this idealising of Hamitic myths by art we must not forget that Greek life became sadly ruined through the worship of Aphroditê. In Greece also, and especially in places where commerce brought the Phœnicians, *Hierodôloi* were found, and the gratification of sinful passions was, in a most shameful way, dignified with the appellation of divine worship.

Hercules we mention merely in passing. That his self-immolation, which was unknown to Homer, was derived from the Hamitic religion needs no further proof. Like the Assyrian Sandan, and the Phœnician Melcarth, he became the founder of towns and the god of civilisation, and we also find Hamitic conceptions connected with Dionysus and Dêmêtêr, the gods of civilisation.

**Sign of Hamitic influence.** We may already, as a general rule, conclude that wherever pain and death are associated with the nature of the deity, there Hamitic religion lies at the base of the idea. Thus Dionysus suffers and dies, and again comes to life; and as human sacrifices were connected with the worship of Moloch, so were they with that of Dionysus also. Such abominable worship as this deity, like those of the Hamites, demanded, is possible only in a series of orgies and

frenzied madness. The ancient form of address to the Grecian god, "Worthy bull," reminds us of the bull-like figures of the Hamitic god. Moreover, the Phallus is not wanting as a symbol. Dionysus is the god of nature-life, which springs up and again fades; consequently, those Hamitic ideas could be associated with him. From the myth of the wandering of Bacchus we know that this religion was widely propagated. Even as early as the time of Euripides, this god is represented as wandering through Lydia, Phrygia, Bactria, Media, Arabia and the whole of Asia Minor, in order finally to arrive at Thebes, one of the most important points at which we notice the influx of Hamitism into Greece. The fate of Persephonê and the mourning of Dêmêtêr are connected with the dying and reviving of Dionysus, who is again, at a later time, correctly recognised in Osiris. With these deities, however, as with Dionysus, are associated the Mysteries of the Greeks. What was introduced as a foreign faith, and as such was opposed to the religion which the people had inherited from their fathers, had to be concealed in the darkness of the Mysteries—especially since these new religious ideas and practices were strange and immoral, and appeared to men to be so. What we now know of the Mysteries of Dionysus or of Dêmêtêr perfectly agrees with the fundamental features of the Hamitic religion, that is to say, the ideas of the suffering, dying and reviving, and also of the sexual energy of the deity. These things were expressed in the Mysteries and often represented in dramatic performances. The divinity revealed in the Mysteries was the Hamitic god of nature-life. With the fate of the deity, however, was connected, just as among the Egyptians, the hope of a future life for the human soul. And this motive, which was left so much in the background in Indo-European religions, must have made the Mysteries attractive, particularly to the more noble natures.<sup>1</sup>

Origin of the Drama. If Hamitic ideas already exercised an important influence on the Grecian mind by means of the Mysteries, the religion of Dionysus gave it a peculiarly

<sup>1</sup> Dollinger, "*Heidenthum und Judenthum*" pp. 109—180.



important stimulus. While the Homeric epic, as far as we can judge, originated wholly from Hellenic genius, yet orgiastic worship was plainly not without its influence upon the development of Lyric poetry among the Greeks. We know that Pindar was an enthusiastic worshipper of the Phrygian Cybelê. It is well known that the drama owes its origin directly to the cult of Dionysus. From the frenzied celebration of the festival of this god, and from the songs which lamented his sufferings and his death, were developed the dramatic exhibitions and representations of these religious events. The chorus of the Greek tragedy remained as a perpetual indication of its religious origin. While, therefore, tragedy was in its transitional stage from the sufferings of the Deity to the overthrow and death of mortals, the Greeks created the highest form of art of which the human mind is capable. In the most profound work of Æschylus, we still find the god chained to the Caucasus; and in *Iô* pursued by the gadfly, the Phœnician Astartê appears unmistakeably. Nor is it by chance that tragedy turns to the House of *Edipus*, in which Hamitic religious ideas had assumed a heroic form. *How wonderful it is that the race of Ham, which bears the curse of sin more than other nations, should give the impulse from which sprang the grandest poetry of Indo-European nations: poetry in which the sin and guilt of mankind are most powerfully and effectively represented and bewailed!* Of himself, Japheth has and knows of no better redemption from guilt and death than his tragedy; that is to say, a poetic redemption. This redemption is, however, nothing but a diving into the depth of the misery of the human race, a proof of the endlessness of its sorrows. And with it is associated the anticipation that there may yet be another redemption beyond. *Tragedy, which is nothing but poetry at the grave, and beyond the grave, thus becomes a prophecy.*

Art derived  
from the  
Hamites.

With the religion of Dionysus and Tragedy we enter the domain of Art. Now, if it is true regarding the religion of the Greeks that it borrowed certain important traits from Hamitism, still more



correctly may we say of the fine arts that in general they owe the elements and origin of their technical development to Hamitic civilisation. Phœnicia, in this case as in all others, played the part of intermediary. A great stream of Mesopotamian civilisation, however, passed through Asia Minor also. From Egypt came the elements of Architecture, and from Assyria those of Sculpture. The first principles of Acoustics reached Greece in the same way. If we take Sculpture into consideration, the most important department of Art among the Greeks, we find that it was not in existence in the time of Homer. Only one image of a deity is mentioned in the Homeric poems, that of Athênê, in the fortress of Ilion.<sup>1</sup> Art then confined itself to the ornamentation of articles in use in daily life, such as weapons and clothing. And even of these things, whatever is mentioned as of chief importance is of foreign origin. Mention is made of Sidonian bowls and garments, of a Cyprian coat of mail, an Egyptian spinning-basket.<sup>2</sup> The Phœnicians exported Egyptian as well as Mesopotamian products. Very expressive is a remark of Homer in which he designates a Sidonian bowl (*kratêr*) a work of *Hêphaestus*.<sup>3</sup> And yet if anyone, on account of these points of connexion, wished to prove Hellenic art to be a daughter of Hamitic, he would simply succeed in showing that he had failed to comprehend the genius of the Art which developed itself among the Greeks. Originality and geniality of mind nowhere manifest themselves in creating what is absolutely new, but in appropriating what is at hand and in reforming what is foreign. Thus Greece remodelled, according to the genius of her own religion, the very numerous foreign myths she had accepted. Brunn is right in referring, as an example of this, to the method in which the Greeks appropriated the Phœnician alphabet. "The Greeks borrowed from the Asiatics," he says, "the *written symbols*, as it were, of Art; but in Art, also, from the very beginning, they

<sup>1</sup> Iliad VI., 92, 303.

<sup>2</sup> Iliad XXIII., 741—743; VI., 289—291; XL., 19—22; Odyss. IV., 125—127.

<sup>3</sup> Odyss. IV. 615—617.

spoke *their own language*." This historian of Art has the merit of having demonstrated this statement, by referring to the description of the *Homeric shield*, which is of special importance in this question. Brunn shows that "the idea and the distribution of the various parts are to be regarded as Greek, but the material execution is in accordance with Asiatic (Assyrian) models." The development of Greek civilisation would have required much longer periods of time had it been obliged to discover independently the first principles of everything, as, for example, the alphabet. Thus Greek Art was indebted to Asia for its first principles, in order to enable its genius afterwards in its onward course to reach the heights of Olympus so marvellously soon.

Hellenic  
Science and  
Philosophy.

From this it must appear to us probable that Hellenic science and philosophy also received their first impulse from Asia. Nay, further, we may say that it would be very strange if such a connexion had not existed. Without doubt Pythagoras did not discover independently such a peculiar doctrine as that of the transmigration of souls, but derived it from a Hamitic religion. "But no doctrine," says Zeller, "can be traced back with greater certainty to the founder of this school of philosophy." It is also highly improbable that the Pythagorean system of arithmetic and mathematics was developed from Greek sources, because, as we have seen, these sciences had already, at a very early period, reached a high state of development among the Egyptians as well as the Chaldeans, and must have been widely diffused in conjunction with the Babylonian coinage, and their system of weights and measures. Future investigation, which will have at its command richer Hamitic sources of information, may arrive at the conclusion that Pythagorean philosophy may, through its connexion with the Orphics and their Mysteries, have derived numerous principles from Hamitic religions and sciences. But it will be shown with regard to other Greek philosophers also—for instance, the Atomists—that there was a connexion between their materialistic doctrines and the fundamental principles of Hamitism. Nothing but new discoveries and a continued series of investigations in the

domain of Hamitic forms of civilisation will suffice to turn these probabilities into certainties. But in this matter, also, only an undue prejudice in favour of the importance and independence of Greek science and philosophy can be apprehensive about the result.

Relation  
between  
Hamitic and  
Semitic  
civilisation.

Finally, let us consider briefly the relation which subsisted between the Semites and Hamitic civilisation. It has already been shown that many Semitic tribes were wholly lost in Hamitism,—for example, the Assyrians, the descendants of Arphachshad in Babylonia, and the Joktanite Arabs in South Arabia. Hamitic civilisation may also have been affected by some Semitic influences. Perhaps this explains the fact that it was only in Egypt, a purely Hamitic land, that the worship of animals received such a development. Again, the fact that the Assyrian kings did not allow themselves to be worshipped as gods, as did the Pharaohs and the kings of Babylon, but regarded themselves merely as “the representatives of the gods upon earth,” seems inexplicable except through Semitic influences.<sup>1</sup> We have a prayer in which the king, in thoroughly Semitic style, confesses his human weakness and sinfulness.<sup>2</sup> As for the other tribes, however, they gradually accepted the religion of Ham, and in so doing incurred Ham’s fate. This fate is manifested in an appalling manner in the history of Balaam the Seer.<sup>3</sup> As Abraham was still able to find Melchizedek a priest of the God of Shem, and was blessed by him,<sup>4</sup> so the Semitic seer from beyond the river sees in the people of Israel the instrument of the GOD of Shem, who is also *his* God, and he is obliged to bless this people, though he was asked to curse them. But in the fearful end of this prophet, whom the Israelites slew with the sword because he had counselled the king of the Moabites to seduce them, is manifested the end of those Semites who fell a prey to the seductions of the Hamites.<sup>5</sup> For a time Balaam

<sup>1</sup> The *Assyrians* were *Semites*, while the early inhabitants of *Babylon*, whose descendants, even to the latest times, formed the bulk of the population of southern Mesopotamia, were *Hamites*.—W. S. C. T.

<sup>2</sup> *Vide* a prayer on a tablet in the British Museum, referred to by F. Lenormant in his “Manuel de l’Histoire de l’Orient, vol. II., p. 131.

<sup>3</sup> Numb. xxii., etc.    <sup>4</sup> Gen. xiv., 18—20.    <sup>5</sup> Numb. xxxi., 8.

tried to serve both GOD and the Hamitic king, but at last he became the slave of the latter.

This leads us to speak of the nations of Moab and Ammon, which were so nearly related to Israel. The shocking history of their incestuous origin<sup>1</sup> probably shews how Semitic tribes were led astray and ruined by Hamites (Sodom and Gomorrah). For this history, which reminds us of the similar one regarding Noah and Ham, doubtless contains a kind of prophecy of the future. The cult of Baal-Peor shews how abominable the religion of Moab became.<sup>2</sup>

It was the children of Israel's great task to steadily reject the religion and morals of the Hamites, though open and receptive as regarded the varied influences of their civilisation. As we have already seen, Israel owed to the Egyptians, Mesopotamians and Phœnicians what they possessed of external civilisation. But the training of their hearts and souls the GOD of Shem had reserved to Himself, and He sent His prophets as their instructors. The history of Israel shows what hard struggles that training cost, a typical instance of this being afforded by the life of the prophet Elijah.

The Arabs proved the least accessible of all to the influence of Hamitic civilisation. Just as among the Israelites the Spirit of GOD dwelling in the prophets rejected the religion of Ham, in spite of all the civilisation of the latter, so among the Arabs of pure race the natural isolation of their country, as well as the independence of their national character, produced a similar effect. It was not till very late that the Arabs—we are not speaking of the Sabæans and other mixed tribes—received the alphabet. They were unacquainted with the Babylonian sexagesimal system. The poetry of the deserts of Arabia developed itself quite independently. Though (on account of the Hamitic highways of commerce passing through Arabia) foreign gods might be introduced into the country and be worshipped, here and there casting into the background the one GOD, *Allah*, yet they could not set Him aside altogether.

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xix.

<sup>2</sup> Numb. xxv.

The Arabs, who in ancient times were regarded as the most faithful and reliable of men, adhered with a certain natural fidelity to the GOD of Shem, till Muhammad with his "new light" appeared among them.

If we ask, in conclusion, what influence Shem and Japheth exercised over the Hamitic nations in the earliest times, we shall find that it was only slight. Until their time came, Israel and Ishmael were merely to preserve themselves from the Hamitism which was pressing in on all sides. This, indeed, presupposed that Israel would uproot the worship of Baal in Canaan. It is probable that the Arabs in some places acted similarly. The Indo-Europeans again, were in some instances entirely removed from contact with those great centres of civilisation; though others of them again, like the Greeks and Romans, maintained in those very ancient times an almost wholly receptive attitude. Yet certain myths shew us that at a few points Hamitism had to give way before the Japhethic spirit, just as the worship of Baal in Canaan did before Israel. The myths to which we refer are those concerning Kêpheus and Zakhâk.<sup>1</sup> Kêphên is an old name of the Asiatic Hamites or Cushites. Kêpheus, son of Bêlus and brother of Ægyptus, is regarded as an Ethiopian, and rules sometimes in Babylon and sometimes at Joppa.

With this place is connected the legend of **Human sacrifices.** Perseus and Andromeda. A sea-monster had to be propitiated with human sacrifices, till Perseus, a son of Zeus, slew it, delivered Andromeda, and acquired the sovereignty. In Joppa the Hamitic practice of casting human sacrifices into the sea as offerings to the fish-goddess Derkêto, was for a very long time preserved. Closely connected with this is the Persian myth of Zakhâk and Faridûn. Serpents grow on Zakhâk's shoulders, and these must be satiated with human sacrifices, until<sup>2</sup> Faridûn, the Âryan, annihilates the tyrant, together with the serpents. In both these legends the historical fact is handed down to memory that Indo-European

<sup>1</sup> This is the Arabic and Modern Persian form of the Azhi-Dahâka of the Avestâ. The name means "Biting Snake."—W. S. C. T.

<sup>2</sup> Called Thraëtona in the Avesta.—W. S. C. T.

tribes invaded certain territories of the Hamites and put an end to their abominable human sacrifices. Elsewhere, however, Greek settlers substituted their mother-tongue for the native language of various Phœnician colonies, while for a long time they retained the Phœnician worship together with human sacrifices.

### *DEVELOPMENT OF INDIAN CIVILISATION.*

Before returning in the following chapter to the Greeks and Romans, we still, in the last place, have to deal more particularly than we have yet done with the development of civilisation among the most easterly section of the Indo-European family. It is, perhaps, the most striking peculiarity of the Hindû nation that we can trace back its development the furthest, and that we can follow it up unbroken by any change of religion produced by external influences. It almost appears as if it were intended that in this people there should be exhibited to the rest of the Indo-European tribes a living example to shew to what Japheth's development by himself and under merely Hamitic influences led, and also that the richest natural endowments could not save them from the frightful misery of this development. In an earlier chapter we started from the religion of Varuṇa, as testified to by the Vedas, and found it to be very much akin to the primitive religion of the Indo-Europeans.

The worship of Indra, which is also mentioned in the Vêdas, succeeded that of Varuṇa among the Hindûs. This was a phase of development which, to some degree, corresponded with the religion of Homer. We see in it purely Japhethic polytheism. And only then did Brâhmanism, which in a certain sense is the last stage of Indian religion, develope itself. It is a pantheistic, philosophical, religious system, professed even to-day by many millions, which owes its origin in the first place, to the highest caste—i.e., the Brâhmins, those renowned priests and philosophers. Purely Japhethic elements and motives, however, do not suffice for the historical development of this system. The conception of Brahma indeed, the



highest deity, in whom all the various concrete gods of the religion of Indra became extinct, from whom the whole universe proceeds and to whom it returns in an eternal alternation, unmistakably contains within itself ideal characteristics of Japhethic thought and philosophy. I would call special attention to the fact that no female deity is associated with *Brahma* in the production of the world. Nevertheless, the entire *Brâhmanic* system is swayed and permeated by ideas which can be traced back to nothing but Hamitism. To this in the first place belongs the conception of the world-egg in the *Brâhmanic* cosmogony, and that of its splitting asunder, from which heaven and earth proceeded; and still more the idea that *Brahma* divided his body into two halves, one of which was male and the other female.

It is, moreover, in the highest degree improbable that the *Brâhman*s should have attained to a belief in the transmigration of souls--a doctrine as peculiar as it is important in its consequences--entirely without any connexion with Hamitic religions. The indestructibleness of this dogma, even in Buddhism, compels us to conclude that it did not reach the *Hindûs* through philosophic thought, but through their religious traditions, for it was still entirely foreign to the *Vêdas*. Finally then, the deifying of the *Brâhman*s does not appear as an accidental result of the system, but as the necessary consequence of Hamitic fundamental principles. This Hamitic abomination in a measure surpasses itself in the Japhethic domain of the *Hindûs*, as it did later among the Romans in the deification of the *Casars*; for the pride of the *Brâhmanic* ascetics, as is well known, exalts itself not merely above men high enough to reach the gods, but even far above the gods themselves.

What a contrast to this is the humility and the deep consciousness of sin displayed by the *Vêdic* bards. The division into castes--an institution by which the disagreeable consequences of Pantheism (which allows all beings to be of divine nature) are avoided--probably rests on Hamitic influences. It would in fact be historically somewhat incomprehensible if Hamitic civilisation, which extended from *Babylonia* and



South Arabia especially to India, had not most powerfully influenced the Áryans, who were devoid of culture and yet so capable of it. The religious influence of the original inhabitants of India, indeed, indisputably manifests itself in the rise, at a later period, of the divine *Trimurti*—Brahma, Vishnu, and Sîva. Vishnu—a name, as we know, recognised in the Vêdas—may be a positive completion (proceeding originally and essentially from Áryan views) of the concept of Brâhma, viewed rather negatively and abstractly, but it is certain that Sîva, along with the goddess Kali, was the deity of the aborigines, and that he expresses in the most loathsome form the nature of the Hamitic deity, namely, generation and death. Thus, when Brâhmanism was internally determined by Hamitic religions, it was also able to receive from without the Hamitic deity into its *Trimurti*.

Degree of  
Hamitic  
influence  
disputed. We must regard it as impossible for us to determine how much the Japhethic and Hamitic systems contributed to the development of Brâhmanism. Accordingly, there will always be among learned men a tendency to derive this development of the Hindû religion from purely Áryan sources. There is the same controversy in the domain which embraces the history of the religion and philosophy of Greece. Even in very early times, as we have said above, Ham contributed to the old circle of Grecian gods.

To what degree did Ham—that is to say, Egypt, Babylonia, etc.—take part in the development of the Pantheistic and Materialistic systems of philosophy, both the earlier and the later, in Greece? We cannot answer this question, although Assyrian and Egyptian researches may gradually enable us to look more deeply into it. It is enough for us to know that Greece, and thus Japheth, in those systems (and in quite a special degree in Stoicism, the most influential system of modern times) was infected with Ham's view of the world, namely, that the life of Nature is the deity. The most modern philosophy of the ancient world often seems to be drawing near to the earliest religion of the Hamitic nations; as, for example, when Pliny, the Roman natural philosopher, sees the divine life essentially manifest in the sun.

Again, with reference to the accuracy of our way of dealing with the history of the Hindû religion, what is conclusive is the fact that the Aryans of India in the religion of Brahma attained to the foundation principle of the Hamites—that all living things in Nature, taken all together, constitute the deity. The Brâhmans, the priests and philosophers of India, reached the doctrine of Monism<sup>1</sup> by the spiritual stages of “Âtmâ” and “Brahma,” concepts in which the thinking mind fancies it can discover the nature and ground of all things.

This way of regarding the Universe must at first have had an optimistic character, and it has maintained it as the Religion of Brahma, although amid constant opposition. In so far as in this system the world and the Deity are considered to be essentially the same—only that the world is the Many and GOD is the One—it holds good that the actual is also the reasonable and correct.<sup>2</sup> It is against this obriety of Pantheism, which may truly be termed Paganism’s intoxication with Nature, this Hamitic orgasm, that the human heart and conscience, with its experience of suffering, constantly raises its opposing voice; it is against this view, that in India the

mighty phenomenon of Buddhism also arose in an opposition which has left its mark upon the history of the world. The Brâhmans, the authors of the doctrine of the Identity of the Universe and the Deity, have in the next place turned the optimism of this system to their own account in a most profitable manner at the expense of the ancient gods, as well as that of all the rest of mankind. This they have accomplished by the deification of themselves—a proceeding which has no rival upon earth. On the virtue of their asceticism and the might of their knowledge, gods and men, nay, even the world itself, depend.

<sup>1</sup> Otherwise known as the doctrine of *Identity*, i.e., the identity of the Universe with the Deity—the *Advaita* doctrine of India, the creed of which is expressed in the words *Ekam evâdvitîyam*: “One being, no second.”—W. S. C. T.

<sup>2</sup> I.e., “This is the best of all possible worlds.” This idea recurs in the Pantheism of Pope’s “Essay on Man,” in the words “Whatever is, is best.” It is the exact opposite of the leading idea of Buddhism.—W. S. C. T.

Just in proportion to the degree in which, in theory, the thought and manner of life of the Bráhmans, turning aside from the actual world, merge themselves in the Brahma beyond, and so renounce the whole world, property, family, etc.—(mark the monasticism and asceticism of the Bráhmans)—in the very same degree do the mighty and terrible consequences of this Pantheism make themselves evident in the haughty claims of the Bráhmans. It cannot but be clear to the people that the impersonal Brahma is a mere abstraction (as it really is), and that the authors of it, the Bráhmans, to whom the abstract conception of it is due, remain the true divine power. The “*Âtmâ*,” that is, the *breath* and *spirit* of the world, becomes and remains at the last what it was at first, namely, the mind and *Ego* of the Bráhmans. Strange irony of the course of human thoughts! Never have human philosophy and speculation more boldly and heedlessly given away the material for the invisible, eternal world beyond. (How easy it is for man to believe, if all he has to do is to believe in his own dreams!) The apparent contradiction involved in this annihilation of self for the sake of the other world, which is, in reality the consequence of this system of theorising, has never manifested itself in a more frightful manner. We must consider not only the fact of the deification of the Bráhman, “*GOD is lost*” but also the apparently so widely different religion the root-idea of of Buddhism. Yet both grew out of the philosophy Brahmanism and Buddhism. of the Bráhmans. Both have as their primary assumption the same principle, viz., that *GOD is lost*. R. Roth, in an investigation into “The Idea of Fate in Indian Proverbial Philosophy,” arrives in a peculiar manner at the following conclusion—“A nation from which religions and sects in superabundance have sprung, and which, in the unimportant affairs of daily life, as well as in the great ones of society and of the state, is bound by religious statutes,—such a nation as this scarcely thinks of its gods at all in those sayings which express the final results of its reflection on all human things, and the ordinary rules of life. . . . Thus a nation which (if not in the great majority of its people, who heedlessly tread the once beaten path, at least in its cultured members)

thirsted for religious truth, and for which no degree of asceticism was too severe, no price too high to pay for the salvation of the soul, arrived at the end of its course, as the Græco-Roman world had done, at Fatalism." The products of philosophic thought do not compensate even for the pagan belief in the gods, to say nothing of the revelation of the **LIVING GOD**. The philosophical religions of Brâhmanism and Buddhism differ only in this, that they draw different conclusions from the same premises. In the former, man—that is the Brâhman—is, in a fearful illusion, placed in the position of the lost deity. In the latter religion, one sees an awful reality,—the existence of a world without GOD, and seeks a means of deliverance from it.

Not only in the other castes, however, have been  
Buddhism a  
reaction against  
Brahmans.
 felt the trouble, the misery, and the curse belonging to this "divine" world, nor is it only among them that these things have produced a reaction against the Brâhmanic philosophy. Even the Brâhmans themselves, in spite of their "likeness to GOD," have ever and anon been embarrassed thereby. It is precisely among them that those thoughts were again and again uttered which afterwards gained for themselves in Buddhism an importance recognised in the history, not of religion only, but also of the world itself. Buddhism grew in and through an atmosphere of yearning after and seeking for deliverance from a world, which was a world of suffering because it was a world "without GOD." From among a great number of ascetics and monks of the Brâhmanical and other castes arose Gautama Sakyamuni, "the Buddha" (that is, *the enlightened one*), the founder of this great religious community. Nor did this community owe its origin to one who had been impelled by special suffering to adopt this kind of life. If not a king's son, yet member of a royal family, brought up amid the luxuries and the glories of this earthly life, and enjoying these things,—in the full vigour of youth, happily married and the father of a son,—Buddha turned away from the world, because this life is but suffering and death! His object was to get rid of the terrible burden of an existence without GOD, and without hope,<sup>3</sup> which is all the

more grievous because—on the theory of a belief in the transmigration of the soul, or of repeated births—life does not end with physical death. Strange that the continuity of existence, which was in the religion of the Hamites held to be the most important of all truths, is in Buddhism regarded as the most fearful of curses!

What the most ancient Hamitic religion, that of the Egyptians, tried by all means to secure, the knowledge of the life eternal—that is the very thing which this, the latest stage in the development of Hamitic religion, seeks in every way to get rid of! Even the divine thing in man, his title to eternal life, becomes a curse. That which is the most blessed hope of those who abide in communion with the Holy and Living GOD—that which helps them to pass through the sorrows of this life—the consciousness that their GOD is not a God of the dead, but of the living, becomes despair to those who have lost this GOD. How frightfully has the saying of the Serpent been fulfilled, “Ye<sup>1</sup> shall be as GOD!” For what Hamitism regarded as the divine purport of life, and what was on this account exalted above the present life and honoured as the manifestation of divine energy—namely desire, enjoyment, and especially sexual dualism, but also death and the fading away of life; the being born and dying in order to be born again, as implied in the profoundly significant parable of the bird Phoenix—all this Buddhism on the contrary recognised in its full ungodliness, worthlessness and absurdity, and strove to redeem man from it. For the Buddhist the deity disappeared; the ever-flowing stream of human misery remained. No GOD,

no hope, no joy, no peace! All real object in life  
 no hope. has vanished in contradistinction to all that causes suffering—birth, sickness, death, separation from what is dear to us, and union with what is hateful.

That which lies at the base of such a life, however, is the desire, the thirsting after existence, the impulse which urges us to live. And this stream of misery and tears extends backwards to all eternity—for Buddhism cannot stop at the deity—

---

<sup>1</sup> Gen. iii., 5.

and stretches forward to all the eternities. This is what is implied in the ceaseless passing of all beings (on account of their thirst for existence) into life until they die, and again from death by means of repeated births into a new existence full of suffering. If in this matter Buddhism seems in a fair way towards losing the substantiality of the soul—we must not be understood in a material sense—there is no difficulty in understanding why; for a religion which loses GOD cannot affirm the soul. But the fact of the eternal suffering of the soul is left, and remains to all eternity.<sup>1</sup>

The metaphor of a flame most profoundly and strikingly expresses this. "Living things resemble a flame; their existence, their being born again, is the flame catching and devouring the fuel which this transitory world supplies to it. . . . As the wind carries the flame, so the thirst after existence carries the soul from one state of being to another." "What<sup>2</sup> we call an animate thing is merely a single portion of the domain of occurrence, which consumes and reproduces itself every moment—a flame in this ocean of fire."

**Aim of Buddhism.** Now Buddhism aims at deliverance from such an existence as this—one which, from its very nature, consists in suffering, thirsting, a consuming, and that too ceaselessly and restlessly; it aims at "the surrender of whatever is earthly, the extinction of desire, the cessation of inclination—the end—the *Nirvāṇa*." "The believer, the enlightened one, escapes from the flames of 'coming into being,' of 'ceasing to be,' of 'suffering,' into the world of 'extinction' (*Nirvāṇa*):—into the blissful quiet of eternal peace."<sup>3</sup> This is accomplished at the very moment that knowledge of the facts above detailed obtains dominion in man. Whoever has gained this knowledge, and has looked into the nature of things, and who at the same time has divested himself of desire and longing, the inclination to live—this man has attained to redemption from death as well as from life; he has attained rest and *Nirvāṇa*. In this matter, physical death is not

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Oldenberg, "Buddha: sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde," pp. 258 • *sqq.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, *op. cit.*, pp. 267, *sqq.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 269.



specially taken into account. The soul of the man who has not attained to this knowledge and this redemption from desire and longing will be blown over, like a flame, into a new existence full of suffering.

Now what is *Nirvāṇa*? At the present time European savants are still disputing, as Buddhist scholars did formerly, as to whether this word denotes entire annihilation or rather the complete blessedness and rest of beings. The question is a very difficult—in fact, an almost unanswerable one—since (in these matters especially) Indian thought differs so very much from that of the West. The main point for our consideration is that any life worthy of the name is practically denied to the soul by the doctrine of *Nirvāṇa*. Of the kingdom of GOD and of life in it also it holds good that it does not consist in eating and drinking, and that in its perfection “they neither marry nor are given in marriage,”<sup>2</sup> but through the putting off of the perishable and corruptible the life of the children of GOD will be elevated and glorified from an earthly to a heavenly and divine life of perfect righteousness—“peace and joy in the Holy Ghost,”<sup>3</sup>—to a happy life of love in the GOD of life; to a blessed working in spirit and in power

Buddhist and Christian hope. to an existence and an active service of sons in the Father's house<sup>4</sup> in Paradise, instead of toiling in the sweat of one's brow for daily wages during the pilgrimage of this life. In contrast to this the *Nirvāṇa* of the Buddhist is, in fact nothing but death, even though there be a dispute whether this word signifies utter annihilation or merely the abdication of personality and individuality.

With regard to the dispute between the Materialists and the Pantheists whether at death the soul becomes non-existent or whether it vanishes like a wave in the ocean, all that we would say is to remark in the spirit in which Christ uttered similar words, “Let the dead dispute with the dead.”<sup>5</sup> Assuredly

<sup>1</sup> The word is derived from the negative *nis* and the root *rá*, to blow, and literally means simply “extinction,” “a being puffed out” like a candle.—W. S. C. T.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xxii., 30; Mark xii., 25; Luke xx., 35.

<sup>3</sup> Rom. xiv. 17; xv., 13.

<sup>4</sup> John xiv., 2.

<sup>5</sup> Cf., also, 1 Cor. xv., 42, *sqq.*; Matt. xxv., 21; etc. <sup>6</sup> Matt. viii. 22.

soul which can love neither GOD nor Man must be considered dead, even though a certain kind of existence may have to be acknowledged as belonging to it.

Finally, the ethics also of Buddhism must be of an essentially negative character. It is true that in the doctrine and life of the Buddhists there are not wanting ideal traits. Sympathy, benevolence and beneficence are especially prominent. It is forbidden to destroy any living being, to steal, to lie, to commit fornication, to drink any intoxicating beverage. But when looked into more closely, the motive of these ethics is seen to be not so much love to one's neighbour—the true source whence these virtues must spring—not this, but, on the contrary, the suppression of everything in one's nature which leads one to desire to live; and this has as its natural consequence self-destruction. Love itself, being a manifestation of life and a cause for communicating life and joy to others, must of necessity be annihilated. The Buddhist can have nothing to do with promoting the living of others, for life itself is not worthy of being helped forward. On the contrary, he must concern himself only with the renunciation of his own life. The nearer therefore that the Buddhist

Buddhist virtues suppressed in the "perfect" monk. approaches to his ideal of perfection, the more are the Buddhistic virtues suppressed. The Buddhist to the needy. If all vital energy, all will, effort and desire, is to be rejected, then we can understand that the misuse of life in coming to an end must bring to an end its lawful use also. In Nirvâṇa, that is in the "extinction" of the self and its activities, all ethics themselves must perish, therefore the man who is perfect has burst "the two fetters called good and evil." Nirvâṇa, even in the degree in which it may even in this life be attained, is exalted above everything else.

It is self-evident that with the suppression of all the real significance of life there must necessarily be abolished also the barriers and distinctions of caste, which had been gradually established in India. But if with this we are to compare the abolition of slavery throughout Christendom, we must not lose sight of the difference between them. The emancipation that

Buddhism gives is attained through the abolition of life itself, and through the rest which is to be found in the grave. Christianity on the contrary bestows freedom upon us through the spirit of a new life, of a new love, which rejects even the law, and prefers to work in freedom, and therefore results in a new world and new organic creations. With regard to Buddhism we must admit that it has had and still has a variety of excellent effects, because and in so far as life itself resists its being perfectly carried out, for this would entail the suppression of all life. Christianity is a regeneration of the old man, and so far as this extends a new and a heavenly life begins; while the ultimate goal of Christianity is a new world and eternal life.

Buddhism a  
Japhethic  
reaction.

Must we recognise in Buddhism a Japhethic reaction against the Hamitism of the religion of the Brâhmans? The Hamitic deification of the life of Nature, together with the deification of self with which it is associated, is utterly abolished by Buddhism. For Buddhism directs its assault against the very essence of the religion of the Brâhmans, that is to say against the Hamitic belief in the transmigration of the soul and in future births. By means of repeated births every living being can by the might of his works, by virtue of his merits, raise himself step by step to the position of a Brâhman or even of a god. Should anyone, in consequence of misdeeds committed in the course of former lives, find himself in the most miserable condition, there remains the hope of rising out of this state by virtue of good works. This fundamental principle is shared by Buddhism also. But to this Pantheistic optimism the latter system opposes the confession, which annuls it all, that all such life,

Buddhist  
Pessimism.

with its infinite grades of existence reaching up to the gods themselves, is not worth living. For the aim and object of all existence is not life but pain, misery, and death, and consequently existence itself is a never-ending agony. And Buddhism, as the last articulate utterance of paganism, is right in saying this. It is the confession of the Prodigal Son at the end of his course; it is the acknowledgment of the utter bankruptcy of the heathen world. Does it

not confirm the words of Augustine, "O GOD, Thou madest us for Thyself, and restless is our heart until it rest in Thee?"<sup>1</sup>

Man who has lost the true GOD is not benefitted by making a god of himself. No creature is in itself of eternal worth, just as none has eternal life in itself. Even the great ones of the world, and they in particular, have to say, "All is vanity;" therefore it is that a king was the first to utter these words.<sup>2</sup> We are all without worthiness in ourselves, and can acquire it only through GOD mercifully condescending to allow us to love Him, Who alone is Holy, Good, Eternal and Blessed. We have no eternal life in ourselves, but attain it only because He, Who is the Eternal, the Living GOD, has permitted us to call Him our GOD. Thus the saying of Jesus is true, "GOD is not the GOD of the dead but of the living."<sup>3</sup> For he willeth to be our Father in Christ, therefore we, as His children, cannot die to Him. Christianity, as the religion of GOD'S children, is the religion of Faith, of Hope, and of Eternal Life. Paganism ends in Buddhism, in a religion without GOD and without hope. It knows of no release save that of annihilation. May the time soon come when each one of our brethren of the noble Indian nation shall rise and say, "I will arise and go to my Father."<sup>4</sup> After long and painful servitude in a far country, their Father's house invites them,—the glorious liberty and blessedness of the children of GOD.

---

<sup>1</sup> Confess. Lib. I., 1.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xxii., 32.

<sup>3</sup> Ecclesiastes i., 2.

<sup>4</sup> Luke xv., 18.



## CHAPTER VII.

### THE GOAL OF THE ANCIENT WORLD.

#### *LIFE AND DEATH OF NATIONS.*

THE destinies of nations are even more mysterious than those of individuals. We may well ask whether nations too must die. The life of an individual nation might be continued to as great a length as we are entitled to extend the duration of the human race in general. History shews us short and long-lived nations. Yet another point worthy of notice is the continued existence not only of individual nations, but of whole families or, as they are termed, "races" of men. Greeks, Romans, and other Indo-European nations quickly passed away. Yet the Indo-European family grows and flourishes. Moreover, within the last few hundred years, it has produced a young and vigorous offshoot on the soil of the New World. If we now look at the Semites we find that, even at an early period, certain nations of this race had fallen under Hamitic influence and gone to ruin. In comparison with these the genuine Semites are endued with much more of vital power and endurance. Whatever amount of territory this family of nations may have lost, has not only been regained by the Arabs, but its bounds have been widely extended by the mighty conquests of the latter. A broad belt of Islâmic nations encircles the Arabs of pure descent. Muhammadanism may be waning in Europe, but perhaps in Asia, and yet more certainly in Africa, it is still making progress. And had not a vigorous Christian civilisation been developed towards the South of Africa, that whole continent would have been surrendered to Islâm.



How very differently has the Jewish nation, the second division of the Semitic race, been circumstanced! The Arabs have been identified with their land, or at least with the desert, from the earliest ages. The Jews, even at an earlier period in their history torn from their native country, have now, for well-nigh the last 2,000 years, remained without a home, without a language, and even without a Temple; but they have, nevertheless, proved indestructible. Not only is this nation styled "the everlasting Jew" in the fables current among Christian nations, but it is aware that its own Holy Scriptures promise it an imperishable existence so long as it clings to the Law. So long as the Jewish nation adheres to the Law and the Prophets, even though they have become an unreality to it, the nation will be indestructible, and all the more so in that it can never be devoid of hope. For if any nation be without hope it must, for that very reason, perish.

It was so with the Romans when they had conquered the world; they had no longer any goal to aim at, their mission was at an end. Nothing was left them but to eat and drink, and then to die. How many world-empires have wished to crush like a worm that little Jewish nation! They have perished themselves, and Israel still exists. The Egyptians, the Assyrians, and the Babylonians were the first of them. The one nation—that of the Persians—that did good to the Jews, and permitted them to free themselves from the Babylonian captivity, is in existence still. Then the Greek Antiochus thought to root out the very name of the Jews, and last of all the Romans laid waste their city and country. Yet when the chastening rods in the hand of Divine Providence had done what they were destined to do, they were broken in pieces and burned in the fire. The nation which they smote is still alive to-day.

**The Hamitic nations.** Let us, in the next place, look at the Hamitic nations. With regard to them it is not only this nation or that which has been destroyed, but the whole race. With the exception of the few Christian remnants of the Copts and the Abyssinians, everything is Arabicised. It is important, however, to note at what time the great Hamitic

era ended. Shortly before the close of the seventh century before Christ, Nineveh was destroyed by the Medes and Babylonians. In the second half of the sixth century before Christ, Babylon was conquered by Cyrus, and Egypt was subdued by Cambyses, while Phœnicia became a dependency of Persia. About five hundred years before Christ is the period of the great revolution in the history of nations. From that time the Indo-European nations, the Persians, the Greeks, the Romans, came to the front as rulers of the world. Only one of the most westerly of the Hamitic tribes, the Carthaginians, once more, centuries later, strove with Rome for universal sway. The sixth century before Christ is the time when Ham collapsed.<sup>1</sup> His inheritance was then consumed, his mission fulfilled. The measure of his sins was full. And as Israel had previously fallen upon the people of Canaan and was compelled to destroy them, so the Medo-Persians, the first imperial Indo-European power, were sent to subdue the great Hamitic empires. A new era in the history of nations began, that of the Indo-Europeans.

**Indo-European Era.** Now for the first time three nations of this stock came forward and commenced their career, on the basis of the elements of civilisation received from the Hamites, and in the power of their own richly endowed genius. The Medo-Persians laid the foundation of the new civilisation, Greece gave it mind and form, and lastly, Rome extended it over the world, made firm paths for it, and dowered it with permanence for centuries to come. But after the lapse of five hundred years it had already become evident that, in spite of its most glorious achievements in Art and Science, in spite of the subjugation of every hostile nation by the sword of the Romans, this civilisation also had no final permanence. The tree was not shattered from without, it rotted from within. Religion began to languish. Together with this the Roman empire lost also its eternal and ideal importance, which had claimed the self-sacrifice of the individual. All that remained

<sup>1</sup> It was in the sixth century before Christ, that in India, also, the great reaction of the Japhethic mind took place in the form of Buddhism against the Hamitic principles of Brâhmanism.

was the selfishness of the individual and of the masses crying out for "panem et circenses" (bread to eat and gladiatorial shows to see). Under such circumstances it was necessary that a single man should unite in his own person the whole power of the State. The rule of the Casars was the salvation of the State, though it was at the same time the last stage in its dissolution. When at a later period the Germans fell upon the Roman Empire, the latter was only the carcass which must fall a prey to the eagles. Roman civilisation, however could not be saved, even by the infusion of fresh blood. The Germans would have been infected by the corruption of the Roman Empire, and would have become involved in similar ruin

Japheth would have perished just as Ham had previously done, had not deliverance come from Shem. Let us look once more at the people of Israel and their relations with Ham and Japheth. The first period of the history of Israel passed in opposition to Ham. Abraham goes forth from Babylon; Israel becomes a nation in Egypt. In its struggle with the Hamitic religion of Canaan, this nation grows in fitness for its vocation. The carrying away to Babylon stands forth as one of the last great scenes in its training. What Abraham was when he left Babylonia, Israel had become when they returned from the seventy years' captivity, that is to say, the servant of Jehovah. While Ham collapses under the blows of the Persians, the nation in whom all the peoples of the earth are to be blessed, goes forth from the ruins of the Hamitic world. It is worthy of notice what Japheth proved himself to be to the Israelites after the long centuries in which this son of Noah had been far away, and the heavy hand of Ham had rested upon Israel.

The future conversion of Japheth to the GOD of Shem is prefigured by the good feeling of the Persian kings towards the captive people. They believed that they had found in the Jehovah of Israel some connexion with their own God of Light, Ahuramazda, and in the worship of the Jews and its freedom from idolatry an affinity to their own religion which had no temples. And if in Ahuramazda there still remained a noble relic of the primitive purity of the religion of Japheth, this

belief of theirs was not without foundation ; the more so, as it appears that the Persian religion can be accounted for only on the supposition that it arose under very ancient Semitic influence. One might almost imagine that Japheth was already about to turn to the GOD of Shem, whose words had sounded forth so mightily from the lips of the prophets of the exile. Japheth, however, was still much too proud ; his time had not yet come, and Israel's time had not yet been fulfilled.

The Persian kings turned in preference to the religion of Ham. In opposition to the traditions of their nation, which had retained a good share of ancient Indo-European freedom, they became despots like the Hamitic sovereigns, and like them allowed themselves to be worshipped as gods. Characteristic of the ancient habitual freedom of the Persians is the account which Herodotus<sup>1</sup> gives of the consultation among the Persian magnates after the murder of the Magian Smerdis. At that meeting one voice declared for a republic, another for an aristocracy. Darius, with the consent of the rest, voted for a monarchy.

Herodotus' account of their Polity.

Even at a later period a certain kind of independence was preserved among the pure Persians in opposition to the despotic ruler. But Hamitism irresistibly forced its way into the government of the Persian kings, just as Dénoces, king of the Medes, had already imitated the Hamitic practice in this matter. Together with their Babylonian palaces, the "Great Kings"<sup>2</sup> inherited the Babylonian spirit and mind also.<sup>3</sup> Thus an Artaxerxés Mnémón finally introduced into the whole kingdom the abominable worship of the Hamitic goddess of Nature.<sup>4</sup> We would here remark that the Japhethic tribes, indeed, in their isolation and ancient simplicity, long preserved their ideal moral inheritance, but this was no longer the case when they were placed in the midst of the temptations of Hamitism. We see Persians, Greeks and Romans alike yielding to these temptations, and may even at this early stage in our investigations conjecture that Japheth's development will

<sup>1</sup> Herod. III., 79—84.

<sup>2</sup> The kings of Persia were given this title.—W. S. C. T.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Daniel vi., 7.

<sup>4</sup> Bêrôsus. Cf. 2 Mac. i., 14, sqq.

end in his falling a prey to Hamitic influences, if he receives no help from some other quarter.

**The Macedonian Empire.** Cyrus and Darius, the first Persian kings, freed the people of Israel from their captivity and assisted them in setting up again the worship of their GOD. When, however, the Persian empire sank into Hamitism, it became the prey of another Indo-European tribe. The Macedonians and the Greeks became the rulers of Asia. But Alexander and his successors trod in the footsteps of the Pharaohs and the rulers of Babylon. Alexander got himself acknowledged as god by the Hamitic oracle of Jupiter Ammon; and his successors—especially the Seleucids and the Ptolemies—far surpassed him in blasphemous self-exaltation.

And now for the first time Japheth shewed that particular side of his nature that was hostile to Shem. In the person of Antiochus Epiphanes the Hamitised Greek Empire advanced against the people of GOD, and the struggle for life or death commenced. This struggle, however, was not so much against Israel's political freedom as against its religion, and was fought out not with material weapons only. Antiochus wished to substitute for Jehovah the Olympian Zeus, who had become identified with the Hamitic Baal and was visibly manifested in the Seleucid ruler himself. Thus for the first time did the religion of Ham, in the full glory of Grecian genius and Greek art, seek to overcome belief in the true GOD. And therefore it is that Old Testament prophecy sees in Antiochus Epiphanes the first figure of an anti-Christian ruler.

**Rule of the Romans.** Upon the Hamitised Greek empire swooped down the Roman eagles. After a Herod the Great had, like Antiochus, in vain striven to make the Jewish people prove untrue to the faith of their fathers, the land became a Roman province. Now too the time had come that salvation for the world should break forth from Israel. For the heathen world had exhausted its heritage, the Prodigal Son had reached the end of his course. However nobly Japheth may have begun, he had now come down to eating the husks that Ham<sup>1</sup> offered.

---

<sup>1</sup> Luke xv., 16.

Here we merely glance at the acme of this development, *i.e.*, the *deification of the Cæsars*. Whoever has still eyes to see must acknowledge from this fact that the development of mankind is by no means always a progress from a lower to a higher level, according to the view at present popular. On the contrary, we see the worst period of the decline of the noble Roman nation, in moral as well as in religious matters, going forward hand-in-hand with the growth of its political power and general human culture.

The Roman nation began in as hopeful and promising a manner as did the Indo-European tribes in general. For even if the Roman conception of the gods was a more abstract and intellectual one than was that of the imaginative Greeks, this defect was, in our opinion, richly compensated for by the moral earnestness which inspired the Romans. All creature-life and action appeared to them to be supported and pervaded by divine power. Consequently "religion" was to them the most painfully exact performance of all duties towards this divine power and providence. And when the development of the Roman State and civilisation had reached its height, they attained to the point of viewing a mere man, who was often a monster in human form, as a deity,—nay, as the chief and most universal deity, whose worship was exacted even from the most remote of the subdued nations, while such worship was by no means demanded with reference to the national gods of Rome.

The deification of the Cæsars is the most important characteristic of the age. This fact seems to declare that Idealism was at an end: base reality had stepped into the place of the celestial, man into that of the Deity, and the conquered world, as the scene of the basest gratification and of the lavish enjoyment of all earthly pleasures, had taken the place of the consecrated Fatherland, raised by its gods above Nature and to a higher sphere.

We may say that Japhethism had become changed into Hamitism. Not that this change took place suddenly and at one stroke: such a change could be accomplished only gradually. We can therefore recognise at

Twofold  
character of  
Rome.



one and the same time in the organisation of the Roman State both the characteristics of Japheth and the hideous features of Ham. Very significant as regards this two-fold character are the conceptions of Rome and of the Roman Empire which we find in the New Testament. The Acts of the Apostles and the Revelation of St. John in particular, demand special attention in dealing with this subject. The former book shows us how Christianity spread from Jerusalem to Rome, and while it sets forth the faith of the Gentiles in the Gospel in contrast to Israel's hardness of heart, it has to make prominent those characteristics in Japhethic and in Roman nature which were related to Christianity and favorable thereto. Here then Gentile persons are introduced who, as St. Paul says, by patience in well-doing seek for heavenly glory and honour and immortality,—that is for ideal possessions,—and who find the goal of their aspirations in believing in Christ.<sup>1</sup> With regard to such persons the words hold good that "In every nation he that feareth GOD, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to Him." It is not only in single individuals that Japheth receives the GOD of Shem. On the contrary, the Acts of the Apostles show that the administration of justice in the Roman Empire took Christianity under its protection. Paul was once rescued from the rage of his Jewish foes by being borne on the shoulders of Roman<sup>2</sup> soldiers; and the Apostle of the Gentiles saved his life by appealing as a Roman citizen to Cæsar.<sup>3</sup> And in the fact that St. Paul, although as a prisoner, was able for two years to preach the Gospel in the metropolis of the world, the writer of the Acts sees prefigured the conversion of the Gentiles to Christ.

Yet how soon did the other aspect of the Roman State show itself! Fearfully did the Emperor Nero rage against the Christians of Rome; and we must suppose that in this persecution the two great witnesses for Jesus Christ,<sup>4</sup> Peter and Paul, lost their lives in the streets of the great city. The Rome of the Casars and the deified Casars themselves are

<sup>1</sup> Rom. ii., 7.    <sup>2</sup> Acts x., 35.    <sup>3</sup> Acts xxi., 35.    <sup>4</sup> Acts xxv. 10.

<sup>5</sup> Rev. xi., 7, etc.

the historical facts which form the basis of the seer's prophecy concerning the anti-Christian beast and the great harlot, Babylon.<sup>1</sup> Japhethism, left to itself, does not end in an Athens or a Rome, that is at the height of ideal endeavours and aims in art, science and a truly noble and inspiring view of life, but in a Babylon, that is, under the pressure of the most frightful despotism, namely the worship of the sovereign, and in utter materialism. "The harlot" and "the beast" are the deeply significant and comprehensive images by means of which the prophet represents the character of the Pagan Empire, hostile to Christianity. We may translate these figures into our language and represent them by one word, namely, Hamitism. It is a race of men no longer recognising any ideal beyond the actual experience of life, no longer knowing any higher world, any deity, but deeming indulgence in all earthly forms of pleasure the end and aim of life, and consequently the divinity itself. In this mankind fell from its ideal calling, and so from its true nature also, in the same sense as a woman who has sacrificed her virtue. Nay more, human nature was perverted into the bestial.

#### *THE GOAL OF THE ANCIENT WORLD.*

After these more general observations let us direct our attention to the most important characteristics which enable us to recognise what was the goal towards which the ancient world tended. In the case of leading men—amid the more noble natures—one will probably find, side by side with perfectly ideal developments, others also, such that at the very beginning they let us perceive in them certain errors and sins, but who nevertheless, urged on by a mysterious impulse, at last hit upon the right path. On the other hand a noble commencement of a man's career, a considerable degree of effort, which after all ends in vulgar sensuality, seems to us in the highest degree unnatural. And yet this was the end of those highly-gifted nations of our own race, which are termed the classical. With how proud a step does the intellectual life of

---

<sup>1</sup> Rev. xvi

Greece advance at first ! Painting and sculpture have as their subjects the exalted gods of Olympus ; in honour of these deities temples were built, while men inhabited very simple dwellings ; to them statues were erected while mere men were regarded as unworthy of such an honour. In this also the saying is fulfilled, " Seek ye first the kingdom of GOD and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." While Hellenic art was so piously directed to the heavenly gods, it discovered the prototypes of human beauty which foreshadow to us the grandeur of a glorified world. It was entirely in that habit of mind of the ancient Greeks that Plato's philosophy originated. The eternal " idea," or an ideal world beyond, from which this lower world derives its being and nature, seems to him to be the true reality and the purport and aim of philosophy, while things cognisable by the senses present themselves only as a stream of transitoriness. It is through this idealism of his that Plato has become the prophet among philosophers, from whom all true philosophy must derive its sacred character.

Elevation  
of Hamitic  
ideas by  
Greek thought. We know that through the influence of this habit of mind the Hamitic Nature-goddess became glorified by being transformed into the Hellenic Aphroditê. Moreover, we are inclined to believe that even what has been called the Greek vice (the sin of Sodom), but which, according to its origin, should be referred to as being a genuinely *Hamitic* sin—had often, in early times, an ideal character among the Greeks. We regard such relations as those which subsisted between Achilles and Patroclus as among the models of human friendship. A sense of modesty and a reverence for chastity belonged to the Greeks as to all nations of Japhethic origin. The statues of their gods were at first clothed ; and, in earlier times, gymnastic exercises did not take place without an apron being worn.<sup>2</sup> Hellenic nudity may almost be called bashful and chaste in comparison with Hamitic shamelessness. A certain ideal lustre also lingered to the very last around Greek art.

<sup>1</sup> Matt. vi., 33.    <sup>2</sup> Thucydides, " Peloponnesian War," Bk. I., cap. v.

The æsthetic taste of the Greeks did not permit it to sink into utter vulgarity even after actual life had exhausted all its ideal powers and efforts. For, gradually but irresistibly, did a complete state of bankruptcy in regard to all these noble gifts come about in Greece. The outward sign of this was the loss of political freedom—a loss which presupposes the decline of true patriotism and of the spirit of patriotic self-sacrifice. Philip, King of Macedonia, had already successfully availed himself of bribery, in order to subdue Greece. And this evil, in later times, gained the upper hand to such a degree, that a Polybius could say of his countrymen, that no one any longer did anything for nothing. This process went on until at last Greek faith, covetousness and falsehood became proverbial.<sup>1</sup>

**Vice and its effect.** The Greek vice for a long time gnawed at the vitals of the nation. The ideal lustre which among the Greeks surrounded this Hamitic abomination,<sup>2</sup> together with the public recognition accorded to such connexions among the Dorians, must have helped to spread the evil. There lies a terrible Divine curse in the fact that this nation, which, blinded by human beauty, had no longer any conception of the glory of GOD, was impelled to inflict on the beauty of the human body the greatest disgrace that can be imagined.<sup>3</sup> There is no doubt that this vice contributed its share towards the downfall of the Greek nation. The same thing is true with regard to the institution known as *hetærae* among the Greeks.

Together with the worship of Aphroditê the Hellenes received from the Hamites the abominable priestesses of that cult as well, who by the dishonouring of their bodies, rendered honour to their goddess. It is no wonder that non-matrimonial connexions were throughout the whole nation deemed something morally indifferent. The peculiar thing again—and one which in its results was ruinous—was, that an ideal lustre

<sup>1</sup> Döllinger, "Heidenthum und Judenthum."

<sup>2</sup> Harmodius and Aristogiton indeed stood at the head of the development of the Athenian Republic.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the Epistle to the Romans, chapter i.

often surrounded the *hetæra*, of which the wives who ought to have had it were either deprived, or had never been possessed. While the education of the wife was neglected, the *hetæra* was trained in art and science for the duties of her profession. Thus influential Greeks found in the *hetæra* what their wives could not give them. Periclès' connexion with Aspasia is well known. Dêmôsthênês could say in a public speech, "We have *hetæra* for our pleasure, concubines for our bodily indulgence, and wives for the rearing of legitimate children, and as trustworthy guardians of the inner regions of the house." *Hetæra*, like Phrynê, exposed themselves as models for the most famous images of Aphroditê, and were themselves honoured with statues.

**Lowering of Marriage.** The glorification of what was unnatural and immoral necessarily led to contempt for the natural relation between the sexes, that of marriage and family life. Marriage was regarded as a burden which people tried to shun as far as possible. Unnatural crime by mothers and the exposing of children were quite common in later times. In Sparta, the latter practice was carried out under the superintendence of the State. Hence, Polybius could even in his day trace the decay of the country to these evil habits, taking place as it did at a time when, through the Roman rule, peace and prosperity had been established.

**Asia and Europe merging into one another.** As in the domain of morals we perceive Hamitism gaining the upper hand, so in religion and philosophy also the same thing took place. From the time of Alexander the Great, Asia and Europe were merging into one another. The time had come for the gods of these different countries to be identified with one another. Now if it was thought to unite Indo-European and Hamitic deities with one another and to recognise the latter in the former, this could have only one result—the victory of the Hamitic deities.

The deification of the creature, it is true, occurred among the Indo-Europeans as well as among the Hamites. In the Pantheistic deification of the whole of Nature, however, which Hamitism reveals, the consequence of the error is

evident. Universal Nature, or the life of Nature, viewed as the deity, caused individual gods to be swallowed up in itself. For such views the Orphic and the Pythagorean philosophers, as well as the Greek Mysteries with their Hamitic traditions, had prepared the way. The intermingling of the nations rendered their success complete. People recognised the universal deity either in Dionysus, or in the divine triad—Zeus, Dionysus, and Persephonê.<sup>1</sup>

The philosophy of the age could not but have a corresponding character. It turned away from the highest ideals and inclined towards the vulgar realities of life, whether it viewed the latter in a more Pantheistic manner (as did Stoicism), or in a materialistic way (as did Epicureanism), or again (like Scepticism) rejected every philosophic truth. To all these schools alike it was not of so much importance to know the truth as to secure the well-being of the soul and body. Men differed only as to the various methods of attaining this end, doubting whether it was to be attained through self-indulgence or through abstinence from pleasure. While, however, in the opinion of the Stoics no objective truth was the highest law but only "tranquility of mind," there was often in reality no essential difference between Stoics and Epicureans. The former allowed pederasty and other forms of unchastity as well as lying and suicide.<sup>2</sup>

If we may regard a Plato and an Aristotle as prophets whom the genius of the Hellenic nation inspired to search for truth, these philosophers are only the exponents **An age without GOD.** of a world and age without GOD, and consequently without spirituality,—of an age in which the great Grecian saying, "Man is the measure of all things," was so far degraded as to signify merely that the subjective opinion of mere men must decide everything. An age such as this was

<sup>1</sup> Precisely similar was the case in India, where the many separate gods of Vêdic times afterwards came to be regarded as different forms of one and the same deity—Brahma, which latter again was manifested in the divine triad (*trimurti*), consisting of Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva. The intermediate stage is by Prof. Max Müller, ap<sup>1</sup> termed *Henotheism*.—W. S. C. T.

<sup>2</sup> Döllinger, p. 328.



necessarily obliged to take the last step to complete the working out of the leading principle of Hamitism. This is the deification of Man as he actually exists. Hero-worship and the habit of making heroes of great men, sanctioned by a former age, was a kind of intermediary stage towards this. But there was a vast difference between the apotheosis of the dead and that of the living. Of the former it might at least be believed that death had stripped them of the earthly, the human and the impure, as was supposed in the case of Hercules. Divine worship paid to the living solely on the ground of their supreme power was an utter falling away from the Indo-European view of the Divine, to the baseness of Hamitism.

It is highly characteristic that the first example of this belongs to the times of the Peloponnesian War, in which the great decline of the Hellenic nation began. Greek cities erected altars to the Spartan general Lysander, offered sacrifices and sang pæans to him. After Philip of Macedon had participated in divine honours, his son Alexander was able to issue a definite command to the Greek cities to acknowledge and to worship him as God. In Athens public discussions were held on this subject, but while the orator Lycurgus expressed himself indignantly about the new god, from whose temple no one could come out without need of purification, Dêmâdês and Dêmôsthenês advised the people to submit to the demand, lest while disputing the king's possession of heaven they should themselves lose the earth.<sup>1</sup> Not long afterwards the Athenians voluntarily and most lavishly offered divine honours to Dêmêtrius Poliorcêtês, son of Antigonos, one of those among whom Alexander's realms were divided on his death. What at a later time became universal in Greece was naturally done without hesitation and from the beginning in the Hamitic East. For, as religions, as a rule, travel from east to west, so also do these deifications. When Alexander had commanded the worship of his friend Hêphæstiôn, cities vied with each other in

Beginning of  
deification of  
the living  
in Greece.

<sup>1</sup> Döllinger, p. 314.

decreeing him divine honours. In Egypt the Ptolemies stepped wholly into the place of the Pharaohs. In Syria the Seleucidæ on their coins styled themselves "gods."

**Teaching of Euhemerus.** As the finishing touch to complete the system of deifying men there came at last the teaching of Euhêmerus, a contemporary of Epicurus. Was not the fact of the deification of kings and great men calculated to lead people of necessity to the opinion that the ancient gods also were men deified by other men? Thus Jupiter was thought to have been a mighty monarch of former times, and Aphroditê a celebrated courtesan. Euhêmerism also was directly connected with the Hamitic religions; for, with a certain degree of correctness, Euhêmerus appealed to the graves of the gods in the East,—for example, to the birth of Jupiter in Crete and his tomb there. Now since this view agreed so thoroughly with the spirit of the age and was expounded with cleverness and ability, it is not to be wondered at that it was quickly and most widely diffused, and, according to Plutarch's expression, "spread ungodliness over the whole earth."

**The Roman degeneracy.** Finally let us direct our attentions to the close of the Roman Empire, in which we must at the same time perceive the goal reached by the nations of the ancient world. It is not our duty here to describe its demoralisation from all points of view and in separate details, but rather to seek out, within this wide domain, the points from which this presents itself not as an accidental but as the necessary result of the ancient development of civilisation.

It is well known what sensual and senseless gluttony had already, in the last days of the Republic, taken the place of the simplicity of earlier times. The soul of the Roman had formerly been full of noble thoughts regarding his country and his gods, and his body was the instrument of such a soul. Now, however, the soul being emptied of these thoughts strove to gratify the lusts of the body. In comparison with the Greek nation the marriage and family life of the Romans had at one time been full of noble dignity. Yet in the second century before Christ matters had already come to such a pass

that Metellus Macedonicus, one of the noblest men of Rome, dared to utter in a public speech the jest which we dare not repeat, though so often quoted in later times, regarding the inconveniences of marriage and the dangers attending the neglect of it. Already did marriage seem to the citizens to be an oppressive burden, though one necessary to be borne for the benefit of the State. Thus marriage and family-life must have indeed appeared stripped of all those ideal blessings for the sake of which man is so willing to take upon himself its inconveniences.

In the civil wars the old Roman State, the Republic, crumbled into ruin. If it has been said that there is a mystery at the base of the monarchical form of government, which gives it its peculiar vital power, we may with no less justice say the same with reference to the development of the Republican states of ancient times. There was something mysterious about the distribution and adjustment of power, about the sacrifice of the individual to the whole body, about the firm belief that prevailed in the perpetuity of the State, even amid the most frightful calamities. Now as the existence

**The Roman  
State.**

of this reverential feeling regarding the monarchy on the part of both sovereign and subjects must depend upon the belief that the majesty of the ruler is derived from GOD, and only through such belief can show itself vigorous and lasting, so also these ancient States could not have existed without a similar religious foundation. It was the connexion between this real and tangible world, this actual State, and the invisible divine powers, which gave the former growth and stability. In his political conduct the Roman felt himself at once bound and exalted by religion.

The regulations and restraints imposed by the State were to him not human, arbitrarily devised inventions, but divinely sanctified creations which came into being wholly and entirely under the influence of the heavenly powers. Of no ancient state does this hold good in so deep and so comprehensive a sense as in the case of the Roman. When therefore belief in the gods began to decline, the institutions of the State also lost their firm foundation; and again when the constitution

of the State became unstable, the Roman state-religion also was necessarily shaken in its stability. The dissolution of both these most potent elements of life in the existence of the Romans worked itself out fully with the closest reaction of one upon the other. Who can tell where the beginning of their decline and final overthrow was to be found? This

<sup>•</sup>  
Gradual but  
steady decay. much we see at any rate, that the peculiar endowment of ideal gifts possessed by the Indo-Europeans—an endowment which had its source in religion—of necessity, as it were, became exhausted and was at length utterly squandered. The whole Roman State did not thereupon immediately break down, inasmuch as the people were still for a time upheld by their institutions. But why should this inheritance be thus consumed? We can give no reply but this—Because it did not possess in its religion an inexhaustible spring of health. For the essence of that religion was not the eternal GOD Himself but the creature, even though the creature was viewed from its ideal side.

### *THE ROMAN EMPIRE HAMITISED.*

When Japheth, however, has squandered his ideal inheritance nothing remains for him but to betake himself to the paths of Ham. This is the final and mysterious fate of the Indo-European tribes when left to themselves. Their civilisation is an offshoot of that of Ham; and when their own peculiar energy is exhausted it also ends in the abominations of Ham.

<sup>•</sup>  
Introduction of  
Hamitic deities. As if the religion of Rome had already at an early period to confess its want of perpetuity, it was not enough that it had long before united itself with the nearly kindred Greek mythology, but in the third century before Christ the Phrygian mother of the gods, in whom we have already recognised the Hamitic Nature-goddess, was received among the deities of the State. This purely Hamitic cult was naturalised in Rome during the distress occasioned by the war with Hannibal, that is in the contest with the last political representative of the Hamitic race. Closely connected

with this fact was the worship of Bacchus, which soon afterwards found an entrance into Rome and spread over all Italy. Even at that time, under the cloak of its mysteries, horrible crimes of all sorts were committed, and these led to numerous executions.

About that period, Chaldean astrologers and soothsayers were already to be found in Italy in large numbers. In the time of the Cæsars their number and importance immeasurably increased. Astrology often united itself with the traditional belief in the gods. Frequently, however, it leaned towards the view which at later period spread so widely, namely, that the world is ruled by the inevitable influence of the stars. A belief which, by the laws of birth, attributed all events to their own special constellations, and which, as Pliny<sup>1</sup> says, a multitude of educated as well as of uneducated persons willingly embraced,—this belief, according to which what was once decreed remained inevitably fixed for all future time, caused the Deity to be set aside for ever. Suetonius says<sup>2</sup> that Tiberius acted very remissly with regard to the gods and their worship, as he was wholly given to astrology and was possessed with the conviction that everything happened in accordance with Destiny. Lastly, if we add to this the extraordinary prevalence of the worship of Isis, which spread ever more and more mightily in Rome as well as in Greece, in spite of numerous persecutions on the part of the government, we are justified in saying in this connexion that with the decline of the Japhethic religion, Babylonian and Egyptian Hamitism entered imperial Rome.<sup>3</sup>

The religious character of the expiring Roman Empire and of the ancient world in general at that time was Caesar-worship. Passing from the east to the west, from the Hamites to the Greeks, and from the latter to the Romans, allying itself among the former with

Caesar-  
Worship.

<sup>1</sup> Pliny, "Hist. Nat.," II., 23.      <sup>2</sup> Suetonius, "Tiberius," cap. Ixix.

<sup>3</sup> Döllinger, p. 484. In the cult of the "Thousand-named Isis," and of the Egypto-Grecian Serapis we see the latest and most important Theocracy that rests on a Hamitic basis. In Serapis the most important male deities of Heathendom were blended together, as were the female deities in Isis.

hero-worship, and among the latter with the worship of the *Manes* and of the *Genius* of the State, and advancing by means of certain intermediate stages, the deification of Man—the final point in the development of ancient civilisation—was ultimately accomplished. Yet it was a historical necessity that it should be so. The republic had already permitted divine honours to be offered to Roman generals or prefects in the eastern provinces. When the monarchy, however, was founded by *Cæsar*, Rome and its Senate also were ripe for the adoption of a similar line of conduct. Hesitatingly, yet soon, yielding to the spirit of the age, the founder of the universal monarchy allowed himself to be raised to a place among the gods. It was as if the most ancient form of *Hamitism* and the last stage in the development of the ancient world were destined to join hands with one another in the person of *Julius Cæsar*. For the *Julian* family traced its origin through *Æneas* from *Venus* the *Hamitic* Nature-goddess. And as a descendant of *Venus* he was ranked among the gods; his statue was set up in the temple of *Quirinus* with the inscription, "To the invincible god." A comet which appeared after his death was considered to be the new deity received into the company of the gods, and a temple in his honour was erected in the *Forum*.

While *Antony* at Rome represented himself as a descendant of *Hercules* and permitted himself to be honoured in the east as *Dionysus*, and at last allowed himself to be received by *Aphrodité* in the person of *Cleopatra*, *Octavius* began his career cautiously. Though he allowed himself to be worshipped in the east in conjunction with the goddess *Roma*, yet in Rome itself he refused to permit divine adoration to be offered to his person during his lifetime. After his death, however, abundance of divine honours were paid to "*Divus Augustus*." Two temples were erected to him, and a new College of Priests was established: indeed, a senator swore that he had seen *Augustus* ascending to heaven. *Tiberius* maintained the observance of this cult with the utmost strictness, while, with regard to himself, he acted as *Augustus* when living had done.



Finally, in Caius Cæsar, the deification of man had already almost reached its acme. This emperor caused himself to be honoured and worshipped in his lifetime as the visible God. He had temples, priests and priestesses and the choicest sacrifices. No one, however, in the whole Roman Empire offered any opposition save the Jews. The emperor's infatuation reached such a pitch that—a thing which was considered as insanity—he seemed to himself to be GOD. At night on his couch he courted Luna and disputed about precedence with Jupiter Capitolinus. Instead, however, of being satisfied with the popular phrase, "The Insanity of the Cæsars," we ought rather to blame the age which not only willingly endured such insanity but even spontaneously offered its rulers inducements to it. The world was worthy of its Cæsars.

**Deification of  
Women.**

Women also were raised to the rank of deities. Caius caused his sister, Drusilla, with whom he had lived in a shameful relation, to be given the same divine honours as Augustus. Nero did the same for his wife, Poppæa, whom, as was believed, he had kicked to death. He himself, however—the murderer of his mother, of his wife Octavia, of his brother and of his teacher—was the first to be represented on coins during his lifetime as the god of light with a divine *nimbus*—an honour which had been accorded to Augustus only after death. Let us in conclusion mention only one other fact. The Emperor Hadrian raised to divine rank the beautiful youth Antinous, with whom he had formed an unnatural and sinful connexion, and who had given his life for the superstitious Cæsar. He built in his honour a city in Egypt, called after his name, and propagated his worship throughout the empire. How little such deification of a man was compulsory may be judged from the fact that this cult continued for centuries and was carried on zealously, especially in Egypt. If Cæsar was GOD, he could also—and especially Hadrian could, who was pleased to deem himself Jupiter Olympius—associate with himself a Ganymede.

In the deification of the Cæsars we have to deal with a historical phenomenon which is by no means the result of

chance. To understand it we must place ourselves at the point of view of heathenism, which knows nothing of the absolute distinction between GOD and Man as exhibited in the Old and New Testaments. This phenomenon, however, is to be understood only as the goal of a development which gradually obliterated all those ideal features of the Indo-European religions which were opposed to the deification of man. And this was once for all fully accomplished in the disappearance of distinct nationalities and their absorption into the one great mass of humanity in the Roman empire.

Origin and  
goal.

The progress of the ancient world from the unity of its origin to this oneness of its goal is a wonderful one. Between these two points lies the separation of mankind into nations and languages and religions, and not this only, but also the subdivision of each nation into its various classes and degrees of rank and authority; and moreover the resolution, so to speak, of the Deity not only into the various national gods opposed one to another but also into the multiplicity of divine beings in *one* national religion. This latter process of separation and distinction was most widely prevalent among the Greeks and Romans. And now at the close of this development we see the removal of all these contrasts. The nations and languages are subdued by *one* civilisation, the Græco-Roman. And within the Roman nation itself the various gradations in society, and the different degrees of rank and authority cease to exist. There is now only *one* nation and *one* head, the Cæsar. This nation, however, is no longer the Roman but the whole mass of humanity in one. And the

The Second  
Adam of  
Heathenism.

emperor as the head of the ancient world is the Second Adam whom the natural development of the human race had produced. Like the first Adam he unites all mankind in one in his own person. Thus then, under these circumstances the last remaining distinction between the Deity and mankind necessarily disappears. Cæsar becomes GOD—in fact the universal God of the empire. For, as the last step in the evolution of the Roman empire was to do away with separate nations, so also it involved the abolition of separate religions. All the gods of ancient times

were indeed national deities, and belonged to particular countries. None of these deities was adapted to develop into a universal deity. All such development must in this matter result in failure. The Cæsar, however, was the ruling power of the "whole world" (*orbis terrarum*); he was much more powerful than all the hundred-times-divided Grecian and Italian gods, who at one time ruled in the narrow circles of

Cæsar the  
Universal  
Deity.

Roman national life. When the Cæsar became God, he was not a provincial deity, but the God of the whole empire, whose worship was accordingly observed to the most distant bounds of the imperial dominions. For example, under Nero a temple to "Divus Claudius" was erected in far-off Britain. Not the worship of Italian deities but rather the adoration of Cæsar was demanded of foreign nations. The effect of this whole process of development was in fact that the individual gods were lost in the universal god-head of the emperor. Therefore it pleased the emperors to be worshipped in the rôle of the chief gods. Hence Caius appeared as Bacchus, with *thyrsus* and ivy wreath; as Mercury with the herald's wand; as Apollo with the *nimbus*. In the same way Nero appears on Eastern coins not only as Zeus, Zeus the Deliverer, Zeus the Saviour of the World, but also as Apollo and Hercules.

Now if the deification of the Cæsars resulted by a kind of necessary consequence from a development of the ancient relations of religious affairs, one can understand that it met with no great amount of opposition from even the best people of the time. Opposition first arose when flattery overwhelmed the most unworthy among the Cæsars with divine honours. The philosophically enlightened members of society by no means formed an exception in this respect. They knew full well how to interpret this worship from the standpoint of their view of the world. The numerous Euhemerists found it most easy to do so. If the ancient gods themselves were only deified men, why should not this honour be accorded to the Cæsars, who in power to benefit or to injure by far excelled all that preceded them? Pliny the elder takes very nearly this position as a naturalist

Little, if  
any, opposition  
offered to  
this.

and a pure materialist. To him the deity is Nature, or the sun in particular; and as a naturalist and a pure materialist he approves of the deification of the Cæsars as being in accordance with the very ancient practice of placing the benefactors of mankind among the gods.

Thus the goal of the ancient world was reached in the deification of man—the abomination of Ham. There was, as has been shewn, a process of development among the classical nations determined by an inherent necessity. And yet at the same time the religion and morality of Ham stood forth as a pattern to which Japheth should conform.

This may be clearly recognised from the rite of consecration by which the reception of the deceased Cæsar among the gods was symbolically represented. The corpse was placed on a funeral pile which was itself constructed in the form of a pyramid several storeys high, probably in imitation of the Mesopotamian pyramid towers. While the pyre was rising in flames, an eagle would soar aloft from its highest storey towards heaven, and was considered either as a symbol of the soul ascending to the sky or as the bearer of the soul. In all this nothing else was represented but the most ancient Hamitic ideas regarding the burning of Hercules-Sandan, or Moloch, which had already found their way into the Greek myth.

Degradation  
of Man  
connected with  
his Deification.

With the deification of men in the worship of the Cæsars is most closely connected the degradation of man to the level of the beast, nay even below the beast. If the boundary between the God-head and manhood is overleaped as far as certain individuals and classes are concerned, then the rest of mankind naturally sink in a corresponding degree and become subject to the arbitrary and absolute, because divine, will of the former class. The institution of slavery itself is one of the earliest of the inevitable consequences of Paganism in general. The gods are gods of the nation, not the gods of mankind at large. And the nearer to their gods the individual members of a nation deemed themselves to be, the further removed from and the more exalted above foreigners did they consider themselves.

The comparison instituted in the following sentence is of genuinely Hellenic origin:—"The Greek stands in the same relation towards his gods that the Barbarian does to the Greek." A state of slavery, therefore, was a perfectly natural one for the Barbarian, according to Greek ideas.

The existence of slavery among the people of Israel belonged to the limitations of the Old Testament, and was a consequence of the connexion of the Jews with Pagan civilisation. But the sun of the mercy of the GOD of Israel casts its rays, as is well known, even upon slaves. Now the position of the slave certainly differed very materially according to the moral and religious condition of a nation, and again according to the stage of development which it had attained. Under the conditions of the simple patriarchal times it was possible to regard the slave as a member of the family. Such conditions existed among the people of Israel, and in the early stages of civilisation among the Greeks and Romans also. What a contrast did this state of things form to the vast estates and the troops of slaves possessed by the Romans of later times! It is well known that the slavery of these later periods, together with the accumulation of wealth and landed property in the hands of a few persons, became one of the main causes of the downfall of ancient civilisation.

Let us direct our attention to one aspect of the civilisation of this last period, which, as a final and fearful result of slavery, is one of the most significant signs of the time. We refer to the *gladiatorial shows*. The origin of these **Gladiatorial Shows.** indeed goes back to the ancient systems of civilisation prevalent in Etruria and Campania, and they are perhaps of Hamitic derivations. In Rome for a long time these combats took place only at the solemnisation of funerals, and had evidently a religious import reminding us of human sacrifices among the Hamites. When, however, the Roman nation was rising, and had already risen to the acme of its power, murder became its most favourite amusement. The shocking spectacle consisted of an ever-increasing number of victims and a greater variety of methods of putting them to death.

In the last days of the Republic the desire of courting

popularity had already stimulated the leaders of the various parties to ever-increasing exertions in this matter. But everything done previously was far surpassed by the emperors. According to Augustus' own statement, about ten thousand men appeared in the eight gladiatorial exhibitions of his reign. A hundred years later Trajan caused the same number to fight at a single festival, which indeed lasted for four months. *There* were to be seen the tattooed Britons, the fair-skinned Germans, the tawny Moors of North Africa, and the negroes of the South, shedding their blood in honour of the imperial nation and its Caesar.

In the great fencing-schools at Rome as well as in the provinces, thousands of men, chiefly slaves, criminals and prisoners of war, yet also including volunteers among their number, were fed and trained like brutes for the death-struggle. On the last day before the exhibition the gladiators and those about to fight with beasts were given in public what was called a "free meal," at which they were most abundantly feasted with costly food and drink, and sight-seers were allowed entrance. At this feast, while the ruder and half-brutalised among these unfortunates, careless of the next morning, gave themselves up to immoderate gluttony, many might be seen taking leave of their families, confiding their wives to the care of their friends and giving liberty to their slaves. Here might be observed also Christians, who were about to shed their blood in the arena for their faith, celebrating a last love-feast.

The spectators not only viewed the bloodshed with pleasure, but also regarded it as a sort of offence if a gladiator hesitated to die. With whips and red-hot irons were the timid and hesitating driven to the fight. From the tiers of spectators excited to fury, sounded forth the words, "Kill, whip, burn!" "Why does this fellow fall on his sword so timidly?" "Why does that man direct the death stroke with so little heart?" "Why does that other fellow die so unwillingly?"

**Fights with Beasts.** It is quite comprehensible that this thirst for blood should seek other means of gratification. Side by side with gladiatorial combats there took place fights



with beasts, in which animals were killed by other animals, or by men. On the same abominable level with the gladiatorial shows may be placed the custom of making the execution of criminals, or those condemned to death, a popular amusement. With this, moreover, was connected one last matter which shows the frightful result of classical æstheticism. The forfeited lives of criminals were made use of in order to exhibit before the eyes of the people the sufferings and death or the disgrace of the characters in tragedies, not in appearance only but in the most living reality; yet at the same time accom-

Treatment of Criminals. panied with the most tasteful adornments. There was hardly one of the tortures and frightful forms of death known to history and literature, with the representation of which the people were not entertained in the amphitheatres. Here, again, scenes taken from ancient Hamitic mythology—as, for instance, that of the mutilation of Atys, or the burning of Hercules—held an important place. Death by means of garments especially adapted for instantaneously bursting into flames and consuming the unfortunate wearer must have been so very common that such a dress was technically termed “*Tunica<sup>1</sup> molesta*.” Thus Nero, as is well known, caused the Christians to be burnt as torches to illuminate the night.<sup>2</sup>

Perhaps the procession of gladiators before the Emperor in the arena and their cry, “Hail Caesar, those about to die salute thee!”<sup>3</sup> is the most significant representation of the character of expiring heathendom. On the one hand is the deified man, on the other the brutalised men who slaughter one another at his bidding, and all around is the imperial nation enjoying this bloodshed. If Caesar is a god, or rather the Deity, then he has not only the power but also the right to bring about such shedding of blood; and those who made him Caesar and God—namely, the sovereign people—have a right to enjoy it. But which is the more brutalised—those unfortunate beings or this deified man and his nation—humanity standing on the pinnacle of civilisation? In the domain of Carthage, Rome

<sup>1</sup> Martial.<sup>2</sup> Tacitus, “*Annales*,” Lib. xv., 44.<sup>3</sup> “Ave, Cæsar! morituri te salutant.”

sought with all the rigour of the law to eradicate the human sacrifices which the Carthaginians offered. These were always repugnant to the genius of the Indo-Europeans. And yet in the gladiatorial shows we see a far more hideous antitype of that Hamitic custom. In the latter there was, however, a certain grandeur and elevation, inasmuch as one's dearest object was offered up to the deity. And even the Pyramid-building of the Pharaohs, with its waste of human life, was not devoid of every noble feature. When, on the contrary, these human sacrifices were degraded into being exhibitions intended to relieve the *enmi* of the imperial nation and of its Cæsar, the brutal part of human nature must have consumed all their noblest feelings.

**Man deified and brutalized.** We stand at the goal attained by the ancient world. The saying of the serpent has been fulfilled: "Eritis sicut Deus" ("Ye shall be as GOD.")<sup>1</sup> The head of natural mankind—the Cæsar—is the Second Adam who rules the earth, and who has become as GOD. But this is indeed the *Serpent's* promise. Deified Man has become a beast, degraded from the image of GOD to that of the Serpent. Hence the Word of GOD calls that deified Man "the Beast," and speaks of those civilised men as marked with the name of the Beast.<sup>2</sup> This is the ultimate purport and meaning of those very ancient animal symbols which the great world-empires could never dispense with when they wished to represent themselves, and by which the Prophet Daniel had already represented them.<sup>3</sup> They are derived from the Hamitic circles of ideas, in which the Divine, the human and the bestial were intermingled with one another. They denote—whether we think of the Assyrian lion or of the Roman eagle—simply the fact that the world-ruling empires and great civilised nations, according to their natural development, subjected the world to their own selfishness, and were as little fitted to bless mankind within the domain of their rule as the lion or the eagle. What Christ says in that great speech of His—"Ye know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over

<sup>1</sup> Gen. iii., 5.<sup>2</sup> Rev. xiii.<sup>3</sup> Dan. vii. and viii.

them, and their great ones exercise authority over them,"<sup>1</sup> that the world-empires themselves expressed by the symbols of which we speak.

**The Fulness  
of Time.**

Japheth's ideal inheritance is consumed, and Ham's lie has taken its place; yet in such a manner that this lie has worn itself out. The time has therefore come for the truth to appear in opposition to the lie. That Second Adam whom we have mentioned (the son of the man who was led astray by the Serpent, and who exalted himself against GOD, and thereby became a beast) sits on the imperial throne of the world. Thus the time is fulfilled for the coming of the True Second Adam, who, as the true Son of GOD, should unite mankind in holiness and righteousness and reconcile them to GOD. This is JESUS, who, in the connexion

**Coming of  
JESUS THE  
MESSIAH.**

of thought above quoted, says, in contrast to the character of the empires of this world, "Not so shall it be among you; but whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant: even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."<sup>2</sup> That must now come to pass which the Prophet saw after there had emerged before his eyes from the wildly-tossing sea of the life of nations the dread figures of the beasts, and their numbers and their times had been fulfilled. Then the seer saw Heaven opened and beheld the Throne of the Ancient of Days; and One like unto a Son of Man came with the clouds of Heaven to the Ancient of Days. "And there was given Him dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations and languages should serve Him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His Kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xx., 25.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xx., 26—28.

<sup>3</sup> Dan. vii., 13 and 14.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE.

**J**UST as neither a family nor a nation consists of beings perfectly similar to one another in all respects,—the very term “members of a family” implying the existence of a body with its superior and inferior parts—so likewise the human race is not made up of a number of independent nationalities precisely alike, but is, on the contrary, a body composed of manifold members, each of which helps to perfect every other. Even in the sanguinary wars of conquest undertaken by imperial nations we may recognise something of this tendency on the part of mankind towards organisation, inasmuch as the victorious and ruling nation has to show itself superior in ability to rule, and in the possession of the virtues needed for the discharge of this duty. Where, however, such government has been of any duration it has never failed to accomplish something, nor have talent and ability been wanting. With regard to the Roman Empire, for instance, we are reminded not only of the valour of the Romans and of their patriotism, but also of their statesmanship, their skill in the art of war, and their jurisprudence. In this way we may regard the whole of the ancient history of the world as a contest between nations about their relative position, as a trial of speed between them in the endeavour to frame an organisation for mankind at large, and above all as a struggle to crown the whole with one supreme Head of the race.

On the part of the imperial nation, however, this dominion over mankind is in the first place always sought for and

planned from self-interest. A nation imposes its yoke upon those it has conquered, not because it has something better to offer them than anything they already possess, but because it wishes to do so. And inasmuch as in such a case pride, self-seeking and force bear rule, that government cannot be lasting. Therefore, in Daniel the Prophet's vision,<sup>1</sup> the world-ruling peoples emerge in the form of wild beasts from the sea of nations, only once more at the appointed time to be swallowed up in it.

One Divine  
Purpose in  
the World's  
History.

These developments, however, are brought about by a higher Will and in accordance with a Divine Purpose, which, in spite of men's sins, nay even through their misdeeds, overrules human actions to the accomplishment of the Divine aims. When mankind forsook GOD and followed their own thoughts and desires in the world, nevertheless GOD did not forsake them. In the first place it needed to be made clear that, in the natural development of mankind, the human race could not, of itself and by its own power, produce its true Head, its Redeemer and Prince of Peace. After a series of Hamitic empires and Hamitic forms of civilisation, the great Japhethic empires step forward; and in the Græco-Roman period, the classic age, all the power and glory of the natural man exhausted themselves. Although in the person of the Roman Emperor the world gained for itself a head, and although through the annihilation of the indepen-

The World's  
failure.

dence of the individual nations and their absorption into the Roman Empire, an empire of peace, culture and commerce was created, yet mankind groaned under a load of misery. And here we do not refer merely to the tyrants and monsters to be found among the Cæsars. Even the best of the Emperors were unable to arrest the decline of the ancient world. For mankind does not live of and by itself; and while the natural religions which man had originated declined ever more and more, and only Cæsar—that is the bond of union and the one head of the race—continued to exist as a religious reality, this frightful failure on the part of the

<sup>1</sup> Daniel vii. 3 *sqq.*

human race necessarily became most clearly visible in the great empire, in spite of the concentration of its forces.

**The Fulness of Time.** Then, however, the moment arrived which Holy Scripture calls "the<sup>1</sup> fulness of time." In this matter also the Christian proverb was proved true, "Man's extremity is GOD's opportunity." The prophet Isaiah's prediction<sup>2</sup> was fulfilled, "The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; they that dwelt in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined." In contrast with man's handiwork the work of God was revealed. In contrast with the rulers of the world, who like beasts of prey had rent in pieces and crushed the nations, there appeared the Saviour of the World sent by GOD,—the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.<sup>3</sup> GOD caused the

**GOD's Salvation for the race.** Head of the human race and the Salvation of the world to proceed from so humble a nation as that of the Jews,—one unknown to or despised by the world, a nation unable to vie with the imperial peoples of the world in either military or political power, or in superiority of civilisation. And yet this was the people of GOD: how otherwise could the salvation<sup>4</sup> of GOD proceed from it for the whole world's benefit?

What made Israel GOD's people? Was it not the fact that through the instrumentality of a Prophet, Moses, GOD rescued from destruction this unhappy tribe, enslaved by the mighty Egyptian empire, and made them a nation, to which He gave as a law His holy Will, and that He never ceased to remind this people of His Will by sending His messengers, the prophets, and at the same time making known to it its lofty mission, that of being a blessing to all the families<sup>5</sup> of the earth. To this gracious dealing on GOD's part, moreover, the response is man's self-surrender in faith to the Holy and Merciful GOD, such as is found among this people (that is to say in the spiritual Israel), and such as is expressed in the Psalmist's<sup>6</sup> words: "Whom have I in Heaven but Thee: and there is

<sup>1</sup> Gal. iv., 4.<sup>4</sup> Lu<sup>x</sup>, iii., 3.<sup>2</sup> Isaiah ix., 2.<sup>5</sup> Gen. xii., 3.<sup>3</sup> John i., 29.<sup>6</sup> Ps. lxxiii., 25, 26.



none upon earth that I desire but Thee. My flesh and my heart faileth: but GOD is the strength of my heart and my portion for ever."

Thus from the People of GOD proceeds the true Ruler of the world, whom GOD gives to mankind. This is the Shepherd of the nations, Who by His word and His acts stated and shewed that the essence of this divine and heavenly rule lay in His giving His life for the sheep, and Who as the Son of Man (that is as the Second Adam and the Head of Mankind) "came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."<sup>1</sup> For this Jesus of Nazareth, though the carpenter's son and the Galilean Rabbi, is by no means merely a prophet or even a teacher like Socrates, a position to which Rationalism has wished to degrade Him, but on the contrary He was and He knew Himself to be the Son of David, the CHRIST, that is the Anointed King of the People of GOD, and consequently the Head of Mankind. He is the King of the Kingdom of GOD, the Kingdom of Heaven, which knows no limit save the ends of the earth. He knew Himself to have come from Heaven<sup>2</sup> and therefore to be above all who are from beneath.<sup>3</sup>

But because He is not from beneath but from above, therefore He shews forth His Divine and Heavenly nature by giving Himself up to death for us all, and exercises His authority over all by permitting Himself to be nailed to the cross as a sacrifice for all. Thus there must also be fulfilled in Him the prophecy regarding his Master's career uttered with such entire confidence in its victorious issue by Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles and the one among the Apostles who laboured more abundantly than they all: "He humbled Himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea the death of the cross. Wherefore also GOD highly exalted Him, and gave unto Him the Name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xx., 28. <sup>2</sup> John iii., 31, etc.; John xvi., 2<sup>d</sup>, etc. <sup>3</sup> John viii., 23.

should confess that *Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of GOD the Father.*"<sup>1</sup> The Apostle said this at a time when there existed only a small and despised body of Christians, and when he himself was in prison at Rome awaiting a violent death! And now half the world already lies at the feet of Jesus, and Christianity, having in its victorious course reached the utmost bounds of the west, is now turning its steps towards the east, in order to incorporate into the Kingdom of GOD the most ancient settlements of the human race.

Christianity not spread by religious wars as was Islam. All this, however, is done with perfect freedom and by the power of the gentle and humble spirit of Jesus Christ, which is inherent in the words of His messengers. Christianity and Islâm differ radically in this respect. What Islâm commands, namely a Holy War (*Jihâd*) in the name of Allâh and of His "prophet" for the subjugation of unbelievers, that Christianity forbids. When Christian nations make war on each other or on non-Christian nations, such conduct is not of the things of Christ or of the Kingdom of GOD, but is of the world. Wars indeed, like famines and pestilences and other calamities which befall men, are overruled so as to subserve and extend the Kingdom of GOD. Yet the Kingdom of GOD itself does not come by the sword nor by any other kind of violence, for it is not a kingdom of this world, but by the still small voice of the Spirit of GOD in the Gospel, and through the words of the messengers of Jesus Christ beseeching men with the meekness and humbleness of their Master, "Be ye reconciled to GOD."

Apostacy from Christ possible. If in this matter all is freedom and good will, it is plain that it must be possible to fall away from Christianity and to go back to a lower spiritual state from which Christianity had given deliverance. Christianity in fact consists in a self-renunciation on the part of sinful, selfish, and proud human nature, through the power of the heavenly divine Spirit which has appeared in Christ. And in the case of individuals as well as in that of whole nations, this is a process which is not effected once and once

for all by conversion, but on the contrary it is one which must go on during one's whole life. Just as the individual Christian in the course of his Christian life has again and again to contend with the sins of the old man, so likewise the old forces that were at work in the pagan world obtrude themselves anew from time to time within Christendom as a whole and within single Christian nations in particular, and invite a contest.

In this renewed strife what particularly attracts the inexperienced and the multitude is the assertion of apostates that by falling away from Christianity they are pointing the way to something new and higher, and are thus taking a step in advance. Among Christian nations indeed, Christianity is an ancient and familiar thing, and it is a part of man's sinful nature to wish for what is new, even at the risk of losing what is good and gaining what is bad.

Our task then is to show that the so-called *modern spirit* or standpoint of unbelief, which aspires to go far beyond Christianity as if the latter were something quite insufficient, is rather a *retrogression* and a falling back upon positions which Christianity has long since carried by storm.

Apostasy from  
Christianity a  
retrogression.

The history of civilisation in fact teaches us that all the many varieties of times, nations and degrees of culture do not abolish those great and yet simple Divine laws which lie at the root of human development. In short, it is our task to shew that Christianity is ever fresh, that it is the one thing needful, the holy and blessed Revelation of GOD, which is lasting and imperishable amid the irresistible changes of earthly and human things, and that it possesses an inexhaustible power of bestowing upon us mortals everlasting salvation and the hope of eternal life, and gives to our actions an eternal importance.

### MODERN PROGRESS.

1. The most prominent phenomenon presented to our view at the present time in connexion with the development of our civilisation is unquestionably the tendency to take full possession of the earth and to avail ourselves of our lordship

over Nature, which has been carried to an unlooked-for height. The barriers fixed by the oceans are being done away with by means of steamers and telegraphs; the most mighty streams are bridged over, the mountains are tunnelled, and the isthmuses are cut through. A network of railways will soon connect with one another the most remote nations of the various continents, and promote the exchange of their productions. In proportion as the former isolation from one another between countries and continents ceases, these products are valued at their proper worth, for they become of use, not merely to one single nation, but to humanity as a whole. In this way, the quantity and quality of the products of land and water are raised, and the number and value of the artificial productions of industry and trade are increased; and therewith the necessities and comforts of life are enhanced, but simplicity of manners gives way.

This cannot  
and should  
not be  
opposed.

It would be as unfair to lament this development in itself as it would be foolish and shortsighted to oppose it. Even the mightiest ruler could offer no lasting hindrance to international intercourse and to modern industry. But from the standpoint of Christianity, who would oppose the commerce of the world, seeing that missionaries avail themselves of the ways that it opens in order to reach the most distant nations? As a Paul and the evangelists of the earliest times took advantage of the highways made by the Romans for intercourse with other nations, and of the protection afforded by the Roman Empire, so at the present time also Christianity makes use of the channels of modern civilisation in order to carry out its world-embracing mission. Material civilisation is not in itself an evil; on the contrary, it is rather to be considered a blessing. The only question is regarding the use and the abuse of it.

Material  
Civilisation not  
in itself  
an end.

But on the other hand we cannot possibly agree with those who see in the promotion of the growth of civilisation the only, or even the most important task imposed upon the human race. Still less can we agree with those who by means of this development of

civilisation hope to prepare a sort of Paradise for mankind, which would compensate for the other that Faith is wont to consider lost, or as belonging to the next world.

History teaches us to think otherwise. It bids us look at those ages when a similarly high state of civilisation existed, though over a limited area. Those are the ages regarding which Pompeii and Herculaneum bear witness, or again those of which the ruins of Babylon and Nineveh and the sepulchres of Egypt speak. It will, however, appear to us on reflection that it is not by accident that this wonderful resurrection of the glory of a bye-gone civilisation has taken place in our own days. While the panorama of these two great civilisations—the Hamitic and the Græco-Roman—is presenting itself to our eyes, we ourselves are entering upon a third, and one which now embraces the whole world.

**Third great  
Civilisation.**

The efforts of the most ancient and those of the most modern times here meet in a peculiar manner. As in those very ancient times, so now again, people are aiming at a universal system of coinage, measures and weights. Just as Babylon was formerly the source of these essentials of human intercourse, so now, though in a more limited sense, Paris has become such for the modern world. As one of the Pharaohs of Egypt long ago commenced the Suez Canal, so our own age has completed it. The present time resembles that most ancient period in this also, that it possesses a number of independent centres of civilisation, whereas the middle period knew only one such—the great Roman Empire. With Babylon and Nineveh, with Egypt and Sheba, with Tyre and Sidon, we may compare the Great Powers of to-day, jealous of each other and contending for the supremacy.

**Christian  
civilisation  
from stand-  
point of  
Non-Christians.**

If we regard Christian civilisation from the standpoint of non-Christian nations, we can understand how it is that their attention is first of all drawn to the earthly power and the abundance of the good things of this life possessed by Christian nations. Who can shut his eyes to the fleets of men-of-war and merchant vessels of the Christian Powers as they traverse the seas, to their railways and telegraphs as

they gird the earth, and to their armies of brave soldiers that conquer the world? To the extent of these means of procuring them corresponds the abundance of material and mental wealth which is procured and securely preserved through this instrumentality. Now, as in fact many who call themselves Christians permit themselves to be contented with these material blessings, it is natural that those who are without should view this purely human civilisation and culture as the *essential*, nay as the *only* thing which Christianity has to offer to the world. In comparison with this, how unnoticed and unknown, how much despised by nominal Christians, and even impeded by the rulers of Christian nations, is the work of Christian Missions—the preaching of the Gospel.

Look below  
the surface. But how very different does the condition of these Powers appear if we look below the surface and observe their historical development! Systems of civilisation of great importance have arisen without Christianity, but they have decayed and putrified of themselves. It was not civilisation, nor was it the empire of the world, nor again mental culture, nor worldly pleasure, for which the early Christians chiefly cared, but for the salvation and sanctification of their souls for GOD and eternal life. They did what Christ required of those that were<sup>1</sup> His, “Be not therefore anxious, saying, What shall we eat? or What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? For after all these things do the *Gentiles* seek; for your Heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. *But seek ye first His Kingdom and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.*”

These things have been added to Christianity, but Christianity does not consist of them. Christendom, that noble vine planted by God on earth, the trunk of which is the Lord, Christ, and its branches Christians, has fared like the tree to which the first Psalm compares the pious man. “He shall be like a tree planted by the streams of water, that bringeth forth its fruit in its season, whose leaf also doth not wither;

---

<sup>1</sup> Matt. vi., 31—33.



and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper,"—while the wicked "are like the chaff which the wind driveth away."<sup>1</sup>

But the very ground and true root of all happiness is the being planted in GOD, the abiding of the branch in Christ, the True Vine. The eternal value and the eternal life, so to speak, of nations as well as of individuals, consists in this alone. Woe to those who find their happiness and contentment in the good things of this world! To such the words of Christ are applicable, "For<sup>2</sup> what shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world and forfeit his life?" Without doubt the consciousness of an eternity, the thought of another world and a perception of the Divine, are implanted in every man. The fact that in the whole world there is no nation devoid of a religion, proves this. Christianity appeals to this consciousness of the divine and heavenly which is everywhere found in the human conscience.

Human  
intuitions  
testify to  
GOD.

Amid the mighty commotion of great political events convulsing the nations, amid the restless struggle and toil for daily bread and for success in life, the inquiry of the inner man after GOD and eternal life is never silent, nay it increases till it becomes that thirst of the soul which the Psalmist mentions<sup>3</sup>: "As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after Thee, O GOD. My soul thirsteth for GOD, for the living GOD." Now, Christ, the living water, which comes from the eternal world, and the drinking of which ensures eternal life, will satisfy this thirst of the human race, created for GOD.

Civilisation  
is not  
Christianity.

Let no one by any means confound the civilisation of Christian nations and all the earthly splendour attached to it with the imperishable spirit of Christianity, with its GOD-given life and its invisible blessings. In contrast with the great nations of the earth, which possessed earthly wealth and were foremost in art and science, GOD chose for Himself the small and poor nation of Israel, a people without "form or comeliness," as the herald of His name, and the preacher of the world to come. The

<sup>1</sup> Ps. i., 3—4.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xvi., 26.

<sup>3</sup> Ps. xlii., 1, 2.

spectacle presented by this nation, in their whole course from Abraham's time onwards, teaches the same lesson as is summed up in His brief but suggestive address to all the world, an address uttered by Him in Whom all the preaching and prophesying of this nation were fulfilled, "What shall a man be profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" With this message, the apostles of Jesus Christ went to the ancient world at a time when the savour of death and of the decay of that noble Græco-Roman civilisation might everywhere be detected. They went, however, to that dying ancient world in the same way as the Apostles Peter and John went to the lame beggar at the gate of the Temple, saying, "Silver and gold have I none; but what I have, that give I thee. In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk."

#### *CHRISTIANITY BROUGHT NEW LIFE.*

Christianity came with a new life, new powers, new hopes to a world fainting and dying amid all the riches and splendour of its civilisation. And that world was regenerated. Now if the same Christianity which was preached at that time by poor Galilean fishermen, who had neither gold nor silver neither art nor science, much less the political and military power of the Roman Empire,—if this self-same Christianity comes forward now in the attractive garb of modern civilisation,—we entreat all our readers not to confound with one another things essentially different, not to overlook the kernel because of the brilliant shell, not to lose the imperishable because of that which is transitory.

When at the present time Christianity knocks mightily at the door of the remaining pagan nations, they must know that it does not come with the roar of cannon, or the whistle of the locomotive, though these things are compelled to serve it and to prepare its way. It is true now, just as it was in the Prophet Elijah's days, that Jehovah, the GOD of Israel, comes not in the storm and earthquake, but in the still small voice.

---

<sup>1</sup> Acts iii., 6.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Kings xix., 11, 12.

Christ, and eternal life in Him, come in the mild and peaceful words of His messengers, who preach the Gospel, the words of peace and salvation. For they are the messengers of Him, Who, in accordance with what the prophets had foretold, entered Jerusalem,<sup>1</sup> the city of David, and of the Messiah, riding on an ass's colt, a symbol of lowliness and peace. "Say ye to the daughter of Zion, behold, thy King cometh unto thee, lowly, and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt, the foal of an ass." They are the messengers of Him, of Whom once more the prophet said, "Behold,"<sup>2</sup> My Servant, whom I uphold; My chosen, in whom My soul delighteth: I have put My Spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and a smoking flax shall he not quench; he shall bring forth judgment in truth. And the isles shall wait for his law."

Civilisation  
without Christ  
cannot save.

Whoever it be, whether an individual or a whole nation, that does not wish to know anything of the spirit of Christianity, because it demands a change of heart, nay, even a regeneration of the natural man, but is well pleased to appropriate the blessings of Christian civilisation,—let him know that, in so doing, he is entering upon the path which leads to decay and death. Christian civilisation, when separated from the spirit of Christianity, follows the same path as that of those ancient civilisations of Ham and of the nations of classical antiquity. Whoever turns his back on the blessing of Abraham and Shem, which has been made manifest in Christ, may even now for a time wander far away like Japheth, but his goal is the curse of Ham. He who despises Heaven may be able for a time to keep between heaven and earth, but his end is the dust of the ground from which he was taken.

These heralds of such a civilisation—one which carries death within itself—Prophets of Ham, are even now not wanting among Christian nations; and it is important to know their true character. From the standpoint we have now

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxi., 5; Is. lxii., 11; Zech. ix., 9.

<sup>2</sup> Is. xlii., 1—4.

reached in our consideration of Universal History it will be clear that what nowadays proclaims itself as progress is none other than Ham's *primaeval lie*.

The view with which we are dealing presents itself to our consideration at one time as based principally upon modern Philosophy, at another as founded rather on Natural Science.

**Pantheism and Materialism.** In the former case it is called Pantheism, in the latter Materialism. Its fundamental principle is always this, that there is only one eternal divine life, which, being identified with Nature, springs up and manifests itself in the growth and decay of Nature. Those who hold this view prefer to give it the less worn-out name of *Monism*, so as to emphasize the fact that it acknowledges only *one* life, only one existence, namely, that of Nature. They say that man has no right to claim, either for himself or for the deity, an existence and a life exalted above Nature. Resting on this foundation, the Pantheistic school is accustomed to lay stress upon the higher mental manifestations of life in this one divine substance, whereas the Materialistic party makes matter and its lower qualities the central object of consideration.

**This is unveiled Hamitism.** This is the view of the world taken by Hamitism, but among the ancient Hamites it appears in a religious, and consequently in a modified form. Those who inculcated this view were priests; but while teaching it they at the same time veiled it under the cloak of divine worship. It was otherwise when this view of the world came forth a second time during the decline of the Græco-Roman world. Then it was Philosophy and Natural Science especially that promulgated these principles, but not without a historical connection with ancient Hamitism. And once more in our own day philosophers and professors of Natural Science are the preachers of this doctrine. It is strange that the present age should fancy that in this theory it had discovered something new, of which the future alone will reveal the happy results,—whereas the former epochs of civilisation of which we have been speaking bear very clear testimony to the contrary.

Let us now review more closely a few of the characteristic features of modern Hamitism, taking as our starting-point the well-known work of David Friedrich Strauss, entitled "The Old Faith and the New." It is true that this, the last work of the author now deceased, did not achieve the success which he hoped; it was perhaps in advance of its time. On the other hand we have to deal not with its frequently superficial arguments but with the principles which underlie them. And we are obliged to confess with sadness, in spite of the protest of public opinion especially on the part of the Press, that the number of persons included in the "We," in whose name Strauss made his confession, is very large. This indeed is proved by the great circulation of the book. The importance of the work, however, consists chiefly in the fact that for the first time a theologian sets himself up as a preacher of modern Hamitism. Though this attempt has failed, yet more fortunate successors will not be wanting.

As is well known, Strauss paves the way for his positive teachings by his answers to the two questions, "Are we still Christians?" and "Have we still a religion?" No one could wonder that he answered the former inquiry by a decided negative, but it seemed strange to many that he should answer the second question in the ordinary sense by "No." It was on this point especially that the majority of the leaders of "liberal" thought decided against him. They might admit the answer to the first question as regards its essential part; but the feeling of the mass of "liberal thinkers," who had broken away from Christianity, was against a confession of irreligion or, what amounts to the same thing, of godlessness. We shall have to speak of this fact further on.

It is only in the ordinary sense of the word, however, that Strauss denies that he has a religion; in another sense he lays claim to it. As a Pantheist or a Materialist he cannot acknowledge a personal GOD, and together with belief in a personal GOD prayer and all acts of Divine worship fall to the ground. What remains for him is the Universe or Nature, the original source of all life. Strauss

enders to this impersonal, though person-producing All,—that All which generates human beings,—a kind of feeling of dependence, a piety which he calls religion. Now it may be found that this view is highly illogical and we may demand that these last traces of piety be done away with as remains of ancient superstition, in order that modern irreligion may be revealed in its naked form. Natural philosophers who share Strauss' views will certainly make this demand upon the theologian of whom we are treating. This, however, does not concern us. For we would have to distinguish merely between religious and an irreligious Hamitism, and we would have to leave it an open question which of these two views is the worse. We have here to deal with Hamitism in itself.

**Materialism and Idealism.** While Strauss, the theologian and former idealistic philosopher, goes over to the so-called *modern* view of the world, namely to the Darwinism or the Materialism of the Natural Philosophy of to-day, he justifies this step in the following characteristic and appropriate manner: "If in what I have said anyone finds the expression of clear and rank Materialism, I shall say nothing to the contrary. In fact I have always secretly viewed the distinction, often urged with so much ado, between Materialism and Idealism (or whatever one may call the view opposed to Materialism) as merely a trifle about words. Both have their common antagonist in the Dualism which has been the prevailing view of the world during the whole Christian period, and which divides man into soul and body, distinguishes between his existence in time and eternity, and places an eternal GOD, the Creator, in contrast with the created and transitory world. In opposition to this Dualistic view, Materialism and Idealism may be considered as *Monism*, that is, they seek to interpret the sum of the phenomenon by a single principle, and to frame for

---

<sup>1</sup> It may be noted that Prof. Virchow of Germany, one of the leading scientists of the present day, declared in 1891 that all the discoveries in anthropology during the last twenty years tended rather to disprove than confirm the Darwinian theory. *Vide* the appendix on "The Origin of Man," in Translations of the Victoria Institute, Vol. XXIV., No. 95, where a paper of his in the "Correspondenz-Blatt der deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie" is translated.—W. S. C. T.



themselves out of a single piece, as it were, the world and life. One of these theories, therefore, starts from a view taken from above, the other from one beneath."

Here we have the fundamental principle of Hamitism clearly expressed, namely that there is one all-embracing life of Nature, which is itself the deity. This is (as Strauss, quoting from Kant, says) "the phoenix which burns herself only that she may rise to life again from her ashes with renewed youth." . . . "This is, according to the theory of the Stoics, the original existence which throws off from itself the world as its body, but gradually consumes it again, and that too through a great conflagration of the universe; then, however, after the expiration of the great world-year, the formation of a new world begins. Thus also, according to Buddhist teaching, beings and worlds have been ever since the beginning involved in a round of beginnings and endings." This is in fact the philosophical way of expressing the fundamental idea of Hamitic religion, viz., that the deity is generation and birth, dying and death.

This idea has finally expressed itself in its most modern form in the system of Natural Philosophy known as Darwinism. This system, Strauss also, who dared not, at any cost, to lag behind his time, and who had far too little originality to venture upon risking a conflict, embraced with all his heart. The two main distinguishing ideas of Darwinism, however, are natural selection and the struggle for existence. Sexual propagation, by means of which what is more perfect is produced, and death, by means of which the struggle for existence eliminates what is less perfect, are, according to Darwin, the sole divine forces on which depend life and the development of the world. By the aid of these premises Darwin believed that he could answer the great questions, Whence is Man, and What is Man? Let us here allow Strauss to speak. "Incarnation! Who can believe that so many, not merely those ignorant of Science but Natural Philosophers themselves, are persuaded that GOD became man, and yet find it impossible to credit it that animals should do so, to believe in a progressive development from the monkey

to man? The ancient world, like the far east at the present time, thought otherwise on this point. The doctrine of the transmigration of souls unites man and beast, and winds a mysterious, holy circlet around the whole of Nature. Judaism, which is unfriendly to the deities of Nature, and dualistic Christianity have alone made this gulf between man and beast. It is remarkable that even in our own days a deeper sympathy with the animal world is awaking among the more civilised nations, and it here and there calls into existence societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals. Thus one perceives how this, which is on one side a result of modern science, namely the surrender of man's position as the spiritual exception in Nature, recommends itself at the same time to the general feeling."

Here Hamitism is palpably evident. That which appeared to us the most strange thing of all in our historical consideration of the earliest forms of civilisation, namely the worship of brutes, Darwinism has brought very near to us by its doctrine of our descent from animals. And the other thing also which is hardly less curious in that civilisation, that is to say the deification of man, Darwinism will probably soon enough modernise and make extremely popular, when it leaves the domain of Botany and Zoology and begins to concern itself more with Anthropology. For if men sprang from the brutes, what hinders men from becoming gods if the principle of development remains in force? That this may be

Deification  
of Man.

so, we have only, as we can readily understand, to derive our conception of the Divine not from the Jewish and Christian, but from the Darwinian or, if you will, the Hamitic view of things in general. But if Strauss brings forward the societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals as a proof of the spread of Monism, we may certainly and with more reason allege the so-called cult of genius, and the present rage for statues as symptoms of a gradually encroaching deification of man.

By the philosophical method the Pantheism of Hegel long since reached this point. And it appears to us to be significant that the two leading features of the present time,

namely Hegelian Pantheism and Darwinism, the theory of the deification of man and that of his descent from brutes, should meet in David Strauss the disciple of Hegel. *The part of Hegel's system that is derived from above in an idealistic manner, the idea that the Deity through the processes of Nature attains to self-consciousness in man, receives its natural basis from beneath in a realistic way in Darwinism.* The old Hamitic expression of this theory is, as Strauss rightly perceived, the doctrine of the transmigration of souls; and the modern equivalent of this is just this so-called Monism, according to which one common life, at once divine and natural, eternal and temporal, dying and ever generating itself anew, pervades all the orders and kingdoms in the universe.

Pantheism. Let us see how this Pantheism is expressed in the worship of Vishnu<sup>1</sup> in the following prayer:—

Prayer of Prahrada. "Praised be thou, Soul of the Universe,  
The One eternal, essence manifold!  
Thou Lord supreme of all Existence' hosts,  
Than greatest greater, and yet smaller far  
Than e'en the smallest! Hail thee yet again!  
Thou rich in glory, noble, whom the gods  
Honour with folded hands, on whom the meek  
Hermit reflects in cloistered cell, and whom  
Lauding in high-souled hymns the wise adore.  
Ever the same, ever thou art thyself,  
And yet diversified a thousandfold,  
As the One light into a thousand rays  
And colours parts itself. Throughout all space  
Thou rulest, pulsing on in every vein.  
Thou thinkest in all souls. Thy lofty height  
O'ertops Mount Mēru's loftiest peak, yet Hell's  
Deepest abyss is not so deep and dark  
And fathomless as thou in thine own depths!  
All sacrifices flame to thee, and all  
Earth's voices form a chorus to thy praise!  
Praised be thou, and yet again be praised,  
Sun crowned with rays amid the hosts of stars,  
Pole of all suns! Exalted genius!

<sup>1</sup> In the Prayer of Prahrada," published in "Stimmen vom Ganges," a collection of Indian Myths, by Adolph Friedrich, Count von Schack, 2nd Edition, Stuttgart, 1887, pp. 25, *seq.*

Cradle and grave thou art of all that is.  
 Without thee naught can be, for thou art all ;  
 Death art thou : thou art birth, non-entity  
 And entity ! Like as the sacred flood  
 Of Ganges' stream into the ocean flows,  
 So weeds my personality with thine.  
 Yea, this I feel, Lord, Father of the worlds,  
 A vessel with thy spirit filled am I.  
*Like thee I am almighty, deathless ; I*  
*Am thou, myself the Universal soul,*  
 Which was before all, after all shall be."

But just as among the eastern branch of the Indo-European race, in Hamitic Hindûstân, the two mutually hostile religions of Brâhmanism and Buddhism have arisen, so on the basis of the Neo-Hamitism of Germany, a corresponding **Pessimism**: **Schopenhauer**. Pessimism opposes itself to optimistic Pantheism and Monism. Until now the former tendency of mind has found expression chiefly in Schopenhauer's system and in the Philosophy of the Unknown. While Strauss, as a Pantheist and a Darwinian, finds it quite consistent that the deity, that is the universe, should develop itself through pain, misery and death ; while to Strauss "the struggle for existence with its innumerable sufferings and abominations is precisely the fermentation which alone causes motion and progress in the world," a reaction against such a definition of GOD has taken place on the part of the Pessimists. "It must be an ill-advised god," says Schopenhauer, "who could devise no better amusement for himself than that of transforming himself into such a hungry world as the present, so as to suffer distress, misery, and death without measure and without end, in the form of countless millions of living but tormented and troubled beings, who all subsist for a while only by devouring one another." Thus, then, Pessimism like Buddhism altogether denies a GOD, and sees in the world only a blind and culpable desire for life, which man in his guilt and blindness has to understand and at the same time to destroy. To Pantheism and its assertion that this actual world is not only the best, but also the only possible one, because it is divine and rational, Pessimism opposes itself with the declaration that it is, on the contrary, the worst possible world, and worthy of nought but

destruction. This is the same unanswerable objection with which Buddhism opposed and still opposes Bráhmaism.

These two different theories of the universe can oppose each other in such a manner only because they are founded on what is essentially the same basis, that is, they are confined within the limits of this natural world. They are both Hamitic; one is inspired by Baal, the other by Moloch. One speaks as if drunk with Nature and intoxicated with pleasure, the other with a consciousness of the sadness of this world, which is wrought by death, and which itself worketh death.<sup>1</sup> The one has in it as much and as little truth as the other.

Only the tendency as yet. What we have hitherto considered, however, is only the feeble beginnings of what is yet to come. We are still at the very commencement of that development of culture which the thorough working out of Hamitic principles will bring us. As a rule, we in Germany are still too poor, and the enjoyment of life is as yet far too defective. There is still lacking the earthly Paradise, on the basis of which Hamitism will yet cause to flourish its religion of the present world. Wars, which do not permit the nations to attain to the full enjoyment of existence, still threaten us. It is not only the fear of future and the terror caused by actual wars, however, which prevents this. The constant state of preparedness for war does not allow the nations to attain to that degree of affluence which they might reach. The same onward progress of civilisation, however, which creates and increases universal intercourse, the industrial development and the enjoyment of life among nations, has also a great influence towards the prevention of war. Growing intelligence in itself will not, as Buckle affirms, put a stop to wars. But the more powerfully and extensively this cosmopolitan stream of civilisation influences the life of nations, the more unmistakeably it proves itself a great and irresistibly increasing power, the nearer will be the prospect of wars being prevented and shortened.

It is, however, obvious that as long as different mighty

---

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. vii., 10.

nations and states exist, so long will wars be carried on. But this modern current of civilisation seeks to weaken the contrasts and differences between nations, just as it does away with the natural barriers of seas and mountain-chains. In the direction towards which this current is setting lies also the great World-Empire, which will no longer permit any interruption to the intercourse of nations, and will establish the earthly Paradise. It is no longer Reformed Jews alone, destitute of a Fatherland, who dream of this World-Empire.

Tendency  
of modern  
civilisation. The more a life of luxury and of money-making prevails among men, the greater also will be the prevalence of efforts to establish the religion of this world and to justify this tendency of men's lives. The higher intellectual life, heart and imagination of our nation, however, are still ruled by Japhethic and Semitic traditions. Not only Christianity with all its very manifold branches of modern civilisation, but our great mental powers also, which are of Japhethic or Indo-European origin, still contend against the encroachments of Hamitism. This then is the direction in which the civilisation of the present time is tending. It is of this that we have to speak in the second section.

#### *STRAUSS' WORK DISAVOWED.*

2. If we had reason to regard the appearance of Strauss' work as a significant sign of the times, its almost general disavowal by the public is not less significant. But to draw from this fact the conclusion that the German nation had thus given an essentially Christian reaction would be an error. It was precisely Christian circles that remained fairly undisturbed with reference to the book; and they were right. It was not intended for them. It was intended for those sections of our nation which had lapsed from Christianity. And—to adopt Strauss' own language—if one wishes to know whether life still remains in an organism which appears to be dead, he is wont to make the trial by means of a strong, and also painful irritant—perhaps by a puncture. To the deep vexation of the author, the strong irritant afforded by his



book was followed by a not less forcible reaction on the part of those sections which we have mentioned. The modern culture of Germany, however far it may feel itself to be removed from the Christian faith, manifested no inclination to recognise in Strauss the interpreter of their views. And indeed this attempt to Hamitise was so far from being successful that the author in his own book argues against himself. In order to conceal the vast void and blank which yawns before the reader, after the critical dissertations and the positive exposition of Darwinism there follow two chapters about our great poets and musicians, as if for the satisfaction of the hungry reader.

In these chapters fruits are served which did not grow in the garden of Ham. These are the works of Lessing, of Göthe, and of Schiller, the music of Gluck and Haydn, of Mozart and Beethoven. Now we are far from wishing to put these men forward as representatives of Christianity, though this might be done with more reason than a Strauss has for turning them into supporters of his own views. We by no means confound Göthe and Schiller, or Mozart and Beethoven, with Bach and Handel; both the latter Strauss expressly rejects. What at any rate is certain is that these men and their works are not witnesses in favour of Materialism or of a Hamitic view of the world.

Their deity is not the Nature which generates and again destroys itself—not Cronos who devours his own children. Even when Schiller and Göthe, in their well-known poems, "The Gods of Greece," and "The Bride of Corinth" (in which no rational man will expect to find these poets' confession of faith), in a certain sense renounce Christianity,—the Christianity of their time, however, seemed to the former to be a rationalistic Monotheism, and to the latter a monkish caricature,—yet they do not do so in the interest of Atheism and Materialism. On the contrary, in the contemporary Christian view Schiller did not find enough of the divine, nor the divine sufficiently near him; and he thought to find in the Polytheism of Greece the satisfaction of his longing for the divine. What an impertinence it is to try and make this man an apostle of the godlessness of Strauss!

**An ennobled Japhethism.** If we wish to define more exactly the view of the world taken by the representatives of our classical poetry and music, we may call it Japhethism ennobled and more or less sanctified by Christianity. The latter indeed preponderates in some of our classical authors, as for example in Haydn. On the whole, however, the works of art of this period are inspired by Japhethic ideas, whether they be thoughts borrowed directly from classical antiquity or a modern philosophy derived from the Indo-European genius. Christianity plays rather the handmaid's part, as typical of which we may perhaps regard the figure of Gretchen in its relation to that of Faust.

This period is far from the Monism or Materialism of the present day, so far indeed that in contrast with the latter we must call it a distinctly idealistic one. The actual world is of importance to it only in so far as it is brightened and illumined by the eternal Idea. In most decided contrast to modern Monism, that whole theory of the universe, like Plato's philosophy, rests on the dualism of life and of the ideal. Deeply impressed by the difference between the human and the Divine, the temporal and the eternal, the actual and the ideal, these masters of art strive to glorify this poor, doomed world by means of the power of eternal life and of divine beauty. Without this dualism, without this yearning after the Ideal and the Divine exalted above the present world, these works of art would be just as inexplicable as the works of Phidias and of Greece would be without the presupposition of an Olympus. These are the old fundamental characteristics of Japhethic genius, which we met with long since in the primæval mythology of the Indo-European race, and from which alone the magnificent productions of these nations could proceed. For it is not merely by æsthetic but quite as much by moral ideals that the Japhethic development in general, and also this so-called classical period of our Germanic life was determined and made fruitful.

In this connexion let us remember Kant and his "Categorical Imperative." This philosopher certainly wandered far from Christianity, and for his theory of the world even GOD's

very existence seems to him superfluous. But when the doubter views the phenomena of conscience, and hears the voice of the Moral Law with its unconditional "Thou shalt," then there arises for him, together with the certainty of the existence of GOD, a perception of the majesty and glory of the Lawgiver and Judge of the World. We are reminded of the awe felt by the most ancient Hindûs for the eternal laws of Varuna, as it expresses itself in the earliest prayers of the Vedas, or of the dread which Sophoclès and the noblest of the Greeks felt for the unwritten laws of the Deity. There is also, according to Kant, an unconditioned dualism of the truly divine and moral, manifesting itself to man from above, and of the human, which only through moral effort gains the victory over the tendency to sin and the radical evil of our nature.

Contrast with  
Darwinism.

What an abyss separates this view of things from the Monism of Darwin, according to which even moral principles can only be temporary results of the struggle for existence, and can have sprung only from an erstwhile brutal state! Let us, however, return to our poets and musicians, to whom Strauss bids his readers flee for refuge when dissatisfied with his monistic theory. In fact this expedient of the modern founder of a religion is indicative of the position of the modern sciolist in culture, for whom the book was especially intended.

If a believer in the modern theory of the universe wishes to enter the temple of Art, he must leave his monistic or materialistic belief like a cloak in the hall, and as if by a process of self-deception soar into the ideal and divine world of which these artists preach to him. For the whole of Art

Art and poetry  
reveal a  
higher ideal.

in fact speaks of a world exalted above the present, in which dwell righteousness, beauty, and eternal life, and from which, through the medium of Art itself, beams of glory fall upon this world of death and tears. So the greatest work of our grandest poet concludes with the sublime thought, "*Alles Vergängliche ist nur ein Gleichniss*" (Everything fleeting is only a type).

Let us here make mention of the greatest of English poets, Shakespeare. As Milton may be termed the theologian

among modern poets, so Shakespeare may be regarded as the prophet among them. A poet, however, must not be a theologian, for what is distinctly theological is not poetical. In so far as Milton is a theologian he is inferior as a poet. But what a poet not only *may* be but *must* be and *will* be, in proportion to his rank as a poet, is a prophet of that higher world, the Kingdom of GOD, which Christianity bestows on us.

If Luther is the greatest theologian of Protestantism, Shakespeare is its greatest poet. As such he at the same time renders to Christianity the highest service he can render, namely the prophet's service in leading men even up to the house of GOD where the very word of GOD is preached, which is better than poetry for it is life and bliss, better than anticipation and longing for it is certainty and possession and enjoyment! The poet has to deal especially with the natural order of things, with the actual world. He should extol the glory of the world as the gift of the Creator, and bemoan its transitoriness, which reminds us of our sin and guilt. But the greater all human and earthly glory is, the greater and bitterer is the lamentation which its overthrow calls forth.

For this reason the greatest poet must always be a writer of tragedy. As a tragic poet he brings forward in his own day, and for the benefit of those living in his own time, the fact expressed in the words of the Prophet<sup>1</sup> Isaiah, "All flesh is grass, and all the goodness thereof is as the flower of the field. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth." We find in *Æschylus* and *Sophocles* also a poetical vision of the prophet's words. What, however, exalts Shakespeare to an importance greater than that of the generality of tragic poets—what makes him a Christian poet—is the sometimes gentle, sometimes powerful reminder which the poet gives us that, above and beyond this world, which is irresistibly hastening to destruction, there is another world, from which the growth, prosperity and decay of the natural world receive their law, and not this only but ultimately also their aim, their goal, and the solution of their problems.

---

<sup>1</sup> Is. xl., 6, 7.

What makes Shakespeare a Christian poet is that with him this higher divine world, which is none other than the Christian, together with the Just and Holy GOD, the GOD of Conscience and of the Last Judgment, but who in Christ is the Merciful GOD, not only rises far above the natural world, but moreover rules in this world by means of conscience and the spontaneous confession of simple men.

Again, the fact that at the same time Shakespeare is not a theologian or a direct preacher of the Gospel, but a poet, moving in the sphere of the natural world, though ever like a prophet pointing to the invisible world of which Christianity speaks, and that, unlike Dante, the great poet of the middle ages, he does not repel and exclude modern people by manifesting the narrowness and exclusiveness of the Romish Churchiness—these things give him a very great importance in the work of calling mankind to the Kingdom of GOD. Shakespeare is a great builder of bridges on the highway of natural life, leading to the heights of the Kingdom of GOD.

Dante and  
Shakespeare  
and others.

It has not unfittingly been suggested, therefore, that a young theologian should have the great English poet placed side by side with his Bible. The same cannot be said with equal justice of any other of our great poets, however certain it may be on the other hand that Schiller and Göthe also as true poets either willingly or unconsciously render similar service to Christianity. For though these poets may have often descended to the level of Japhethism, yet they are not representatives of Materialism and Atheism. And it is precisely these great poets and artists of ours, to whom Strauss points as substitutes for Christianity, that have kept the circles intellectually swayed by them from agreeing with the Hamitism of Strauss' book.

### *THE JAPHETHIC SCHOOL.*

We now therefore proceed to the second great school of thought of which we must treat if we wish to review the development of culture at the present time, its contradictions and its aims. This is *Japhethism*, that is to say that school of

thought which, besides setting Christianity aside, derives its strength and the object of the movement from the character of the Indo-European race. The relation between this system and Christianity is not always the same, on account of the multiplicity of its currents of thought. These are sometimes friendly, sometimes hostile to it. Semitic religion, however, is always ousted from the throne from which it has ruled the hearts and public life of Western nations. Moreover, some wish to abolish it altogether, others allow it a kind of existence, so far that is as it subordinates itself to the prevalent power of culture, or as people say, "reconciles" itself with it. The latter especially are of opinion that the Christian morality at least must be preserved in modern civilisation.

Our system of civilisation has assumed no distinctive name; indeed it is often wholly in the dark as to its origin as well as regarding its real nature. In the domain of Politics and also of Religion it prefers to style itself *Liberalism*. In the department of Education it appears as *Humanitarianism*. Regarded as proceeding from classic art and literature, it is the culture of the *Renaissance*. It has naturally shown itself least important and least fruitful on the ground occupied by the Christian church, where it made its appearance as *Rationalism*; and sought to develop itself as a religious society in *Freemasonry*. After showing itself impotent and having become antiquated in these forms, it now labours to assume in the<sup>1</sup> *Protestantenverein* a form suited to the present time. With this are connected the Reform

The Brahmo-Samaj, etc. movements in India also, such as the Brahmo-Samaj, etc. Samâj and similar systems, which at one time seek to establish a kind of Christianity modified according to a rationalistically enlightened philosophy, at another period strive to collect a number of ethical thoughts taken partly from other religions. We include all these forms of thought under the designation of *Japhethism*, for this term fitly expresses their origin and significance.

<sup>1</sup> It must be observed that in Germany at the present time the word "Protestant," especially in the expression "*Protestantenverein*" has quite a different sense from the word "Protestant" in English.—W. S. C. T.



We are, however, very far from rejecting and refusing everything that owes its origin to such forces as these. How much nearer indeed do they stand to Christianity than does a Materialistic Natural Science. And who would oppose discoveries and inventions simply because they were made by a Materialistic Natural Philosopher? Our Christian culture must not permit itself to be deprived either of the works of classical antiquity or of those of our own great poets and musicians, and things connected therewith. When these works present to our view an ideal world, glorified by Divine majesty and by eternal life, whether by representing beautiful objects in a tangible way by sculpture, or by bringing music in sounds, or poetry in words, to bear upon our inner self, we know, in fact, that in this way there is brought to our notice a prophecy of the eternal life, of a glorified world and a glorified humanity, the fulfilment of which we possess in Christianity, and in nothing else. So far as we have to do with true art and with the eternally beautiful in these matters, so far also must this prophecy be fulfilled. Why should we then expel these prophets from our civilisation, seeing that they bear witness to our faith?

Let us consider the case of a philosopher like Kant, to whom the adherents of "Liberalism" and Humanitarianism appeal not less than they do to Göthe and Schiller. Does he not come forward like a Japhethic Moses, with his "Categorical Imperative" to a generation degraded to the Egypt of Materialism and sensuality, and does he not preach the unconditional authority of the moral law over man? Does he not say in his own way of speaking, "What shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"<sup>1</sup> Does he not preach that man escapes from the house of bondage and the slavery of sensuality only by unconditional submission to the Divine precepts of the moral law? Does he not prophecy of a future world in which dwelleth righteousness?

Now if we extol the noblest representatives of Japhethism

---

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xvi, 26.

so highly that we do not hesitate to regard them as, in their own way, prophets, yet we know that <sup>Christianity still higher.</sup> as the words of Christ are true of the Prophets of the Old Testament, they are still more so with regard to the former class of writers,<sup>1</sup> "Verily I say unto you, that many prophets and righteous men desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not; and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not. Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see." While the people of Israel, instead of believing in the fulfilment, wished to return to their prophets, both the prophecy and its fulfilment were taken from them. When the Jews would not receive the heavenly Jerusalem, or the Kingdom of GOD, which Jesus preached and offered to them, the earthly Jerusalem and the Promised Land were also taken from them. "For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away, even that which he hath."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>Fate of nations that abandon GOD.</sup> This is the frightful fate which awaits the Japhethic nations if they desire to depend only upon themselves. They cannot remain standing by themselves. As Greece and Rome ended in Hamitism, as Hindûstân sank into it, so the Christian nations of the Japhethic stock, if they abandon Christianity, will certainly not continue to remain on the ideal heights of Japhethism, but will perish in the Materialism of Ham. The fearful self-deception, however, in which modern Japhethism is involved, is that it can escape this fate. People fancy that it is possible for them to abandon GOD's path to go their own way, and yet be able to reach the goal or to determine what it shall be. History teaches us in fearfully plain characters that the end of that road is one that has been unalterably fixed by Providence, as it is also one that is in itself necessary; and he who has eyes to see, may see that the system of which we have been speaking has already at the present time reached this goal.

<sup>1</sup> *M. A.* xiii., 17; *Luke* x., 23.

<sup>2</sup> *Matt.* xiii., 12.

Wherein does this necessity lie? All Japheth's noble gifts, all his high-souled efforts, are only a prodigal son's heritage, a capital acquired by guilt and one which gradually consumes away. And what though the prodigal son be immeasurably rich, though he begin business with his capital in a most faultless way, though he exert himself in the departments of art and science also, yet the end is bankruptcy and the feeding of swine in the fields of Ham.<sup>1</sup> A Faust, the type of the Japhethic character, may begin ever so nobly and pursue aims ever so spiritual and exalted, yet the end is the seduction of an innocent maiden, and however affectionate and noble he may be, he becomes her murderer, and blood-guiltiness rests upon him. The highest efforts of Japheth are humanly finite powers, just as the gods of Greece, notwithstanding all their idealism, are only human figures. Japheth's views regarding divine and eternal things are, after all, only human acquisitions, not divine and heavenly gifts. Japheth has not the fountain of living water—the eternal and living GOD Himself, from Whom the powers of eternal life stream forth—but only cisterns which dry up; and had our branch of the human race provided itself for its long historical career even with oceans of fresh water, yet they would have evaporated. The eternal flow is lacking.

“Continuous Progress of the Race.” “Liberalism” indeed dreams of a *resistless* progress of nations, of a continuous development until ever higher stages are attained, and all this brought about by the power of the human race itself. Those who hold this view indeed consider Japheth's very origin, which we regard as the Prodigal Son's leaving home, as not a falling away but quite an advance. For though they are averse to recognising, with modern Hamitism, the animal origin of man, yet, even according to the “Liberal” view, mankind has developed from lower to ever higher conditions. So once more the modern falling away from Christianity is, according to this system, only a step in advance. That is to say “Liberalism” itself claims to be this new and higher

---

<sup>1</sup> Luke xv., 15, 16.

stage of development. In this way, the very fact of the existence of Christianity, and that of its mission among the Japhethic nations, which, in the opinion of Humanitarians, have at times stood higher than the Semitic, remains inexplicable.

Another inexplicable thing is the rapid decline of the classical nations, which are and must be the very ideal of "Liberalism" and Humanitarianism. Yet facts are things in presence of which reason must pause, but will and desire do not permit themselves to be checked by them. And the tendency to "Liberalism" is in the first place a matter of the will. "Liberalism" implies freeing ourselves from all super-human restraints. Humanitarianism denotes making man depend upon himself. It is true that this system occupies itself much with the divine and the ideal; but it is ready to acknowledge these as constituting a law and a power over itself only so far as the divine and the ideal have submitted themselves to its view, and have received its stamp and legitimisation.

By this process, however, the Divine revelation is deprived of its very nature. The nobler form of "Liberalism," such as that known as the "*Protestantenverein*," is unwilling to belong to the category of fools<sup>1</sup> who say "There is no GOD." Yet these men will not accept the revelation of GOD as it is, and in the form in which, under the appellation of Christianity, it has become the portion of Japhethic nations. They desire to model the Deity according to their own philosophical, that is Japhethic ideas. Christianity must, it is said, reconcile itself with culture, that is, it must permit the principles of the Japhethic character and the Japhethic view of the world to reign supreme. Then the Triune GOD is changed into a Monotheistic idea of GOD, the Living GOD is made a creation of thought, and a GOD who hears prayer is turned into a regulative principle in the philosophical theory of the universe, just as among the Greeks the Deity was changed into the æsthetic ideals of glorified humanity. There was

---

<sup>1</sup> Pa. xiv., 1.

indeed still to be found among the latter a bright reflection of the eternal light, but not the light itself, and that reflection gradually died away. It could not be otherwise. When the divine is changed into the human, it shares the fate of the human. The divine cannot, and must not be placed in the current of human development, otherwise it simply ceases to be eternal and divine. Macaulay in one place rightly refers to the stability and unchangeableness of religious and moral truths in contrast with progress in political life, or in mastering the natural world. The former can be more thoroughly recognised and more fully appreciated, but they do not become changed and renewed in their nature by any process of development.

In the two thousand years that have elapsed since the advent of Christianity, has anyone discovered a purer and better morality than that which is preached in the Sermon on the Mount? Only the interpretation and understanding of the words of Jesus have changed and developed. Has philosophy obtained for us a higher degree of certainty regarding the existence of GOD or a fresh insight into His nature? It is faith now (as it was thousands of years ago), which certifies the existence of GOD and consoles itself with the knowledge of the incomprehensible. However, he who does not wish to believe is not helped to do so by any kind of philosophy. Yet "Liberalism" dreams of "the perfectibility of Christianity," only that this is now termed "The reconciliation of Christianity with Modern Culture." To place these eternal truths in the current of development, however, means nothing less than to enter on the path of the Prodigal Son. The goal of this development is bankruptcy; not advance, but returning home and conversion can here save from ruin.

**The Theistic  
Movement  
in India.**

To the same tendencies as those we have already treated of may be ascribed, as has been said above, the Brahmo-Samâj and similar movements in India, which aim at reconciling expiring paganism or its philosophy with Christianity. Whether in these associations rationalistic moral truths are made more prominent, or on the other hand mystico-metaphysical views (*i.e.*, theosophical opinions) come to

the fore,—these considerations may for the present gain more or less support for one or other of these *Samâjes* in one circle, or another. They will not, however, affect the real importance and the ultimate fate of these schools of thought. A silhouette, a mere outline, can never supply the place of the original; abstractions—which are merely cast-off hides—cannot, even if stuffed, be made to take the place of life and of living, vigorous reality.

Christianity is the Living Vine, with its vital sap and its fruit-bearing branches. It is not sufficient to point to this vine delineated in a painting, or to speak about it in the language of poetry or of prose. Even the most beautiful words will not suffice, if they are merely human words, that is, human thoughts, hopes, and desires. No moral fruits can be looked for without the tree itself or a living branch of it. For Christ's words hold true,<sup>1</sup> "I am the true Vine . . . ye are the branches. Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, so neither can ye, except ye abide in Me." He that hath not the Son, hath not the Father,<sup>2</sup>—that is, the true eternal GOD, Who created and redeemed the world. And he who has not Him, the Eternal One, lacks eternal life also, and cannot of himself produce anything which may be able to defy corruption or be of eternal value.

**The substance of Christianity.** Christianity and the substance of the Christian faith, which has overcome the world, and will overcome it, consists in the belief that the man, Christ Jesus, a new and holy graft from above, not from below,—from GOD, full of Divine, eternal life,—has been grafted upon the old, sinful, condemned stock, mankind, and that from Him proceeds life, which conquers death, for every branch of the human race that allows itself to be grafted into this Tree of Life. For faith in Christ, the Son of GOD and the Son of Man, produces a real and vital union with Him. Christianity consists of the "I in<sup>3</sup> Thee and Thou in Me" which accompanies the constant prayer of the Christian. There is a Divine river of life, which

---

hn xv., 1 7.

<sup>2</sup> 1 John v., 11. 12.

<sup>3</sup> John xvii., 22, 23.



has in Christ poured into the world, and which is vital and operative in all believers. For all, when they became believers, denied themselves for Christ's sake, put His will in the place of their own, in order that they might also become partakers of His eternal life. They must all say with the Apostle Paul, "I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me."

It is clear that Christianity thus viewed is something wholly supernatural, which could never be produced by any amount of human pondering, thought, art or effort. It is GOD alone Who creates and redeems. He has revealed Himself, His Grace and Truth, in the man Christ Jesus. Therefore we men have nothing to do but simply to receive this grace, and not in a self-willed and proud manner to put self in its place. Idols, that is false and vain gods, are not only of wood stone and metal, but also of ideas, philosophies, metaphysical and moral systems. But what man devises and makes for himself cannot redeem him. What redeems him must be greater than he is, and must therefore be GOD.

### *THE EVOLUTION OF THE DIVINE PURPOSE.*

3. The time has now come when, together with all the rest of mankind, the last of Japheth's sons also should return from the far country. Indeed, only two of the great Japhethic nations, the Persians and the people of India, still remain to be brought home. It may be that the Indians, after they have bowed their knees before the Son of David, are destined for a grand mission among the numerous nations of Further India and China. The people of India are an essentially religious people, and in this respect they resemble the Teutonic nations.

The great religion of Buddha went forth from Hindústân and subdued the Eastern nations. What will not the Hindûs be able to offer mankind when they shall have honoured the true "Illuminator" of man!

---

<sup>1</sup> Gal. ii., 20.

Christian  
civilisation  
conquering  
the world.

There can be no doubt that Christian culture and civilisation are conquering the world and subduing the nations to themselves. In this work Europe is shewing herself to be the GOD-appointed leader of mankind. If a nation so small in comparison with the vast population of India as is that of England could conquer this great nation at a time when the means of communication were so little developed, and when the route was still round the Cape of Good Hope, how can the world successfully resist the dominion of its head when the resources of European civilisation have been so greatly increased? European civilisation advances on its victorious career, marching forward into the East with its steamers, its railways, and its telegraphs; and it will subjugate Asia to itself as certainly as it will Africa. That continent of the world which is destined by GOD to rule over the human race attains to this authority by a historical necessity.

But the most important and the final question in the history of the world is not thoroughly solved, any more than an individual's fate in life is decided by his choosing an occupation for himself, and acquiring the skill and training useful in such a calling. Of greater importance than intelligence and culture of body and mind is the question of the state of a man's heart, and the bent of his character. Experience very often teaches that the highest talents, and the highest mental culture may be marred by the development of a bad character, and may cause harm even to wide circles of society.

If this is true in reference to morals, the Lord's words hold good with regard to religion also: "What shall a man be profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose<sup>1</sup> himself?" All the glory of the Græco-Roman civilisation could not prevent the downfall of the ancient world, because it had, through a false religion, lost its very soul. Modern civilisation, resting on the basis of all former civilisations and surpassing them all, has, however, become what it is by accepting Christianity,

---

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xvi., 26. This is the exact meaning of the original Greek of this passage.—W.S.C.T.

**Christianity not of European growth.** which is its conscious soul, its ruling heart, as its distinctive characteristic. Europe did not construct its religion for itself. Where are the old, indigenous religions of Europe? We may, nay we must, admit that the first elements of the whole civilisation of our continent were derived from Asia. Yet Europe may rightly style its civilisation its own, in so far as it was borrowed directly from Greece. But Christianity, the mainspring of this civilisation, is not offered or forced upon Asia as if it were something foreign. *Missionaries carry back to Asia what Europe once received from the Missionaries of Asia, the Apostles of Jesus Christ.*

**The truth comes from Heaven.** Now one may say that it does not matter where the truth comes from provided it *be* the truth and what is good and right. The origin of the Gospel, however, proves that the latter cannot be discovered or worked out like an art or a science, or any other human discovery, by any power of the human mind—for otherwise it would be inexplicable why the Greeks or the Teutons or the Hindûs should not have taken part in its production—but that it is a pure gift from Heaven, an act of grace on the part of the Merciful GOD. Not from the Japhethic stock—which had separated itself from GOD, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, in order to take possession of the wide world—but from the family of Shem, which remained loyal to GOD, did GOD take for Himself an insignificant nation, which, having nothing else to give, should give to the world nothing but what it had itself been given from above, namely salvation, that is to say the Saviour and Redeemer of mankind.

**Mission of Israel.** This nation's mission was to bear in mind the origin of the human race from the One GOD—hence all men are of one blood—to acknowledge, repent and bewail as the root of all evil the sin of the human race, that is their turning away from the One GOD—and lastly to look and hope for redemption on the ground of GOD's mercy. Seeing that GOD created mankind of one blood, of the first man from whom all men are descended, and since they are now dispersed and scattered abroad over the whole earth, GOD

will also send the Deliverer and Gatherer, the King and Leader, who will bring together all the dispersed members of the great human family, and once more reconcile them to GOD.

What a grand, mighty, heart-stirring thought ! In ancient times, when each nation sought its own, and thought of other nations only in order to subdue and rule over them, there existed a people that always bore in mind the common origin of all, and consequently originated and highly prized the idea of a common humanity, then unknown to all other nations—a nation which never forgot that in their own Deliverer and Saviour, the Messiah, the Deliverer and Saviour of all mankind would come. The mere historical fact that such a nation existed shews that the Hand of GOD was moving in the matter. How could such a tendency and such a tradition, a body of prophets and believers—"the Israel after the Spirit"—ready to sacrifice themselves for mankind, while maintaining their divine mission,—how could these ever exist and be operative in a nation whose natural character was more self-seeking and self-interested than that of any other, so that even now it acts like a scourge among the nations, unless the Spirit of the Merciful GOD was living and active among that people ? The prophets of the Old Testament laboured, suffered, and shed their blood for their sacred calling, which was to preach

**The** and testify that Israel was a spiritual people, a  
**Prophets.** Divine priesthood among mankind. When failing in this hard struggle, however, their noblest thought and their final comfort ever was that they were all but imperfect fore-runners, merely types of Him who for all the world and for all ages and in a perfect manner would accomplish what they aimed at, namely the union of GOD and man, He being their GOD<sup>1</sup>, and they being His people.

Thus this nation as a whole, by its institutions and ordinances in general, was a prophet, though each person in it was not forced to obey from his heart the spirit of the whole, for there always existed in Israel the impious and the murderers

---

<sup>1</sup> Rev. xxi., 3.

of the prophets. Again, individual Israelites, who made themselves wholly vessels and instruments of the Divine Spirit, and allowed Him to subdue and change their earthly and natural disposition, became prophets and priests for their own age, as Israel was intended to be for mankind at large. Let us glance at the prophetic spirit of the people of Israel, as seen in their institutions.

By His prophet Moses, GOD led this nation, as  
Israel in  
Canaan a  
type. a wretched horde of slaves, out of Egypt and through the wilderness into the Promised Land of Canaan, in order that it might there, in communion with GOD, live for its mission. Thus this GOD-given land, with all its blessings, became an emblem of that Paradise where once GOD dwelt with the first man in bliss, and was also the type and prophecy of a perfect redemption yet to come, of an earth purified from sin and again turned into a Paradise, where God and man united will live together in endless blessedness. The nation was commanded by Moses to rest upon the seventh day, after six days of labour, and thus to commemorate its redemption by God, as well as its holy calling. Every Sabbath or day of rest on which Israel kept the feast of its Merciful GOD and partook of GOD'S gifts without toil was a memorial of Paradise in which man received the necessities of life, in communion with God, without care and the sweat of his brow, and a prophecy of a future happy time without any tears of misery and trouble.

However, only those Israelites who really wished to be what GOD had destined all Israel to be, namely a holy nation, separated from the sins of the heathen, and willing to keep the commandments of GOD, were entitled to and could comfort themselves with these hopes. This separation was effected by the isolation of the country, and circumcision also reminded the Israelite of it. The people were being continually sanctified by the grand sacrificial worship, embracing the whole life and springing out of the spirit and character of the holy nation. What belonged to the whole Pagan world as an expression of the heart's deepest need, that of reconciliation with the deity by sacrifice and the being cleansed from sin, was realised in

Israel in a clear and holy manner. Israel also knew what was for the most part concealed from Western nations by their lack of culture—what, however, the people of India have ever affirmed—viz., that man has of himself no right to shed the blood of animals. Man is allowed to kill animals only because GOD has given him the animal world for sacrifice.<sup>1</sup> To slaughter is to sacrifice. All the blood belongs<sup>2</sup> to GOD, because the soul of the animal is in the<sup>3</sup> blood, and GOD alone is Lord of everything. Men, however, need a sacrifice. They cannot appear before GOD in their sin and uncleanness, they need the mediation of sacrifices and priests. What sinful man was unable to do, namely to devote himself entirely in a holy manner to GOD, and to spend his life for GOD, was accomplished in a vicarious manner by the sacrifice of an innocent animal. And as the animal vicariously gave its innocent blood, so also the priest solemnly offered the sacrifice as the representative of the people. Upon such a substitution, on such sympathy and mercy, however, rests the whole life of mankind. From its very beginning GOD, the Creator of the world, has based life upon such a substitution. Parents care, think and labour for their little ones; and grown up children do so for their feeble parents. The rich ought to give to the poor, the strong to help the weak, the wise to think for the unwise. For the human race does not consist of a number of individuals, each standing alone, but is a large family, each member of which is bound to share what he has with him who has not. Even the animal world is linked to man by serving him.

Nevertheless the sacrifice of an animal for man can only be a type, a prophecy of the higher, the perfect sacrifice. For indeed as an irrational creature it does not belong to the domain of freedom and of morality. Besides this, the priest is only an imperfect mediator and representative, since he himself is not without sin, and what he is in his office of holy mediatorship between man and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gen. i., 29 ; viii., 20 ; ix., 1—3.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. i., 4; Lev. i., 5, 15; iii., 13; iv., 7, etc.

<sup>3</sup> Lev. xvii., 10—14.



GOD often accords badly with what he is as a man. Thus the Israelites had kings also, whose duty it was to defend them against their enemies abroad and to rule them wisely at home. This was done by David and Solomon. But as even the best of the kings of Israel were not free from sin, so also most of them forgot the divine mission of their people, and sought by mere temporal policy to place the nation among the kingdoms of this world. The mass of the people sided with their rulers in their efforts to divert the nation from its heavenly destiny.

To avert such an apostasy the prophets arose, who reminded the people of their duty to be GOD's people—to become the prophet-nation among mankind, and also to sacrifice their life for their testimony.

When finally the worldly and GOD-forgetting policy of the rulers of Israel brought the people into conflict with the great empires of Assyria, Egypt and Babylon to the ruin of the State and the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple—the nation also would have been destroyed, had it been only a nation like other nations.

But at this very time the voice of the Prophets sounded loudest, announcing to the people that the promises of GOD should not be made of none effect through human folly, nor the faithfulness of GOD through man's apostasy. While the temporal kingdom of Israel, while the State and the Temple, its priesthood and its sacrificial worship were coming to an end, the predictions of the prophets rise more and more clearly and more and more confidently with regard to the eternal King from the root of David, whose dominion should know no end as regards time, and no limit as regards space, and Who should unite in Himself what was separated and imperfect in the Divine service of Israel, in its priesthood and its sacrifices, its royalty and its prophetic office.

In this way the whole nation of Israel and its history present themselves to us as a great prophecy of the perfect Redeemer of mankind, of the King and the Head of the great kingdom of GOD which is to embrace all the nations of the earth. After mankind had proceeded from

Israel a  
prophecy.

the hand of GOD and from one blood, but had afterwards been alienated from GOD and had gone its own way, as shown in the history of nations, GOD planted and reared one tribe especially, namely, the people of Israel, until from it the wondrous Man should spring, who said of Himself, "I am the True Vine." All nations of the world are to become branches in Him, until in Him and through Him the whole of mankind has become one holy plant. The history of the world shows that only those nations grow and prosper that have become branches of this Vine.

However, before we inquire into the nature of this Man, and at the same time into the object of our faith, we wish first—as we have above commenced with history—to ask what are the fruits of the tree of which we are speaking, and whether these fruits are visible or not. Only then shall we search into the ultimate, invisible foundation upon which it rests.

Effects of  
Christianity  
admired.

Even those who have fallen away from Christianity, and who no longer wish to acknowledge Christ as the object of their faith and as their Redeemer, for the most part admire the effects of Christianity, so far as love and mercy are manifested in them, and praise the Christian morality as a noble one, nay rather as *the* perfect system; while others desire to retain Christian culture only, without Christianity. This means, in fact, the wish to have the building but to destroy its foundation; to love the fruits but to hate the roots of the tree! Let us now see of what sort the fruits are, and how far they are worthy of praise.

Contrast  
between Old  
Testament and  
Paganism.

Even the Old Testament far surpassed Paganism in its requirements with reference to morality. What noble words were those which were uttered by Moses, the prophet of GOD, from Mount Sinai to the people of Israel, "Honour thy father and thy mother; Thou shalt do no murder; Thou shalt not commit adultery; Thou shalt not steal; Thou shalt not bear false witness; Thou shalt not covet anything that is thy neighbour's."<sup>1</sup> These words will for ever form the first principles of morals for the simple, and like a

<sup>1</sup> Exod. 20., 12—17.

schoolmaster prepare them for the perfect moral code of Christianity. For these words, like the whole of the Old Testament, are a prophecy which Christ came to fulfil. It is a mistake to suppose that when Jesus in His sermon on the Mount contrasted Moses and his law with Himself, He wished merely to give a better explanation of the Ten Commandments than that which was current in His time among the Scribes and Pharisees. When Jesus said to the people of Israel, "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, <sup>Christ's</sup> <sup>Moral Law.</sup> Thou shalt not kill,"<sup>1</sup> which law the Scribes and Pharisees thought they satisfied by not taking anyone's life,—He did not give a new explanation of the old law, but He put the perfect and final in the place of the imperfect and preparatory revelation of the holy Will of God, and thus "fulfilled" or perfected the Old Testament law. With a "But I say unto you," He not only forbids killing but also the most secret emotion of hatred in the heart, the malicious word of the mouth, and makes the inmost motion of the will equal to the outward act as regards moral guilt. Again, the prohibition of Jesus is directed against not merely the act of adultery, but even against the glance of the eye which becomes an instrument of evil desire. With regard to behaviour towards our neighbour, Jesus requires us not only not to render evil for evil, but to overcome evil with good; not to love our friend only, but also our enemy, and thus to be like our Father in Heaven, "Who maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust."<sup>2</sup>

In short, the moral demands of Jesus may be summed up briefly thus, that men should consider themselves as one great family, and should treat one another as its members, as children of One Father in Heaven, and should worship GOD as their Father, and at the same time, as His children, love Him with all their hearts and with all their souls, and with all their strength and with all their minds.<sup>3</sup> It

<sup>1</sup> Matt. v., 21.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. v., 27, 28; 43—45.

<sup>3</sup> Luke x., 27.

necessarily follows from such a<sup>1</sup> relation to GOD and man, which in its very nature is love and surrender of heart, that every act receives its value only from this feeling, and without it is worthless. For a servant may do his duty to his master only outwardly, for this is all that is demanded, and he is paid with wages. But it is only in the relation of a father to his children and in that of brothers and sisters to one another that love can prevail.

*MAN'S NEED OF AND RELATION TO GOD.*

Let us look once more at the relation in which man stands to GOD. In Him, the Creator and Preserver, the human heart must find its rest, since it is from GOD and exists by His power. The relationship of father and mother and their love for and confidence in their children, which lives and glows on earth—all this is only a type and prophecy of what is inherent in the eternal Fatherhood of GOD as the prototype and the permanent existence. For the children of men become fathers and mothers themselves, and thus outgrow the family tie. But GOD is the Eternal Father, and men should become ever more and more truly His children. Thus we hear Jesus giving utterance to the command that men should not be anxious about food and raiment as the Gentiles are. The flowers<sup>2</sup> of the field and the birds of the air, which neither sow nor reap, are made the preachers of trust in GOD to men of little faith, and to the foolish who believe that they can preserve their lives by their own power, though they did not acquire them by themselves. Now if man's natural anxiety about his daily bread should not drive GOD from the heart, much less should covetous clinging to wealth or sinful desire be permitted to do so.

<sup>1</sup> In the Old Testament GOD'S Fatherhood is taught, ~~as~~ is the brotherhood of man to man, but far less clearly and fully than in the New.—W. S. C. T.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. vi., 25—34.

It may be said, "However beautiful and ideal this may sound, of what importance are these demands to men who in their own nature are of a very different stamp? **Objections.** Men know nothing or wish to know nothing of the Fatherly Goodness and Providence of GOD, and prefer rather to walk in their own self-chosen ways, to be the architects of their own fortunes, and they do not wish to be restrained in their sinful pleasures by GOD's prohibitions. Again, the natural man exhibits no brotherly love towards his fellow-men, but on the contrary the natural condition of things seems to be a contest in which every man's hand is against his neighbour—the 'struggle for existence.' At the best, men say, in accordance with the moral system of the Pharisees, 'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,' and 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy.'" Thus with regard to these high moral demands, the natural man will declare that he has neither the power nor the inclination to fulfil them."

It is an utter mistake, in fact it is a caricature of Christianity, to find in it, as Rationalism did and the Brahmo-Samâj now does, nothing save law and morality. What Christianity has accomplished and is still accomplishing in the world has not been done by these *demands*, but by its *gifts* and *powers*. "The Law" (that is, the moral demand) "was given by Moses; grace and truth came by Jesus

**The Gospel not a mere moral system, but "The Power of GOD."** Christ."<sup>1</sup> It was not with a new moral system or a new philosophy that in his Epistle to the Romans Paul addressed himself to the then mistress of the world, but he said to them, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel, for it is THE POWER OF GOD unto salvation to everyone that believeth."<sup>2</sup> And in the mouth of Jesus it is not these high moral demands that are found first, but the Beatitudes, "Blessed are the pure in spirit: for their's is the Kingdom of Heaven. Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled!"<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Matt. v., 38.<sup>2</sup> Rom. i., 16.<sup>3</sup> Matt. v., 43.<sup>4</sup> John i., 17.<sup>5</sup> Matt. v., 1—12.

The first thing in the Kingdom of Heaven and its abiding foundation is "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you."<sup>1</sup> For the Kingdom of GOD is the *Father's House*, into which the *children* find entrance, and where they have their home. From children, however, no demands are made as they are from servants, who have to toil first in order to receive their wages. Children first receive everything, as is seen in the case of infants, and then only is obedience demanded from them towards their father. Such obedience, however, is not difficult, for it is but returning love for love—the response and the echo of grace and mercy.

Before GOD, the Heavenly Father, demands of the children of men love and obedience, He has proved Himself to them to be their Father, and has made them His children. To allow GOD to make us His children is the one thing Christianity demands of us. Everything else will be added and will follow of itself. Jesus says, "Except<sup>2</sup> ye become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." The Gospel is the invitation to the Great Supper, yea to the marriage-feast: "Behold<sup>3</sup> I have made ready My dinner, all things are ready: come to the marriage feast." "O taste<sup>4</sup> and see that the LORD is good." When the Prodigal Son returned to his father after wasting his substance in riotous living, he was not classed among the hired servants as he thought he deserved to be, but was received as a son of the family with a feast, and was adorned with a festal robe.<sup>5</sup>

It is not that the Kingdom of Heaven is a house of idleness; on the contrary, it is the duty of those who know the Father's will to work, knowing as they do that "the harvest truly is plenteous but the labourers are few."<sup>6</sup> But the work is not that of servants, nor is it for hire: it is that of sons of the family. And as the position in the Father's house cannot be gained or regained by working, for it is prior to all work, so likewise the children of the House are not to

<sup>1</sup> Ma't. vii., 7.<sup>4</sup> Ps. xxxiv., 8.<sup>2</sup> Matt. xviii., 3.<sup>5</sup> Luke xv., 11—32.<sup>3</sup> Matt. xxii., 4.<sup>6</sup> Matt. ix., 37.



trouble themselves nor to be anxious about any need or suffering that may befall them in the world. For as children of their Heavenly Father, the Creator and Almighty Lord of the world, nothing can happen to them but what will work together for their good,<sup>1</sup> although like infants they may not understand with regard to much that is sour and bitter that it is the medicine the Father gives, Who formerly said to His people Israel, "I am the LORD that healeth thee."<sup>2</sup>

Christianity as a new life contains mysteries. Now if Christianity is a new life, if we (from being men forsaken of GOD and certain of only one thing, namely that we must die) are made GOD's blessed children, partakers of the eternal life of Him Who is "not the GOD of the dead but of the living,"<sup>3</sup> then we might be surprised if this new life did not contain mysteries, as natural life does. The certainty derived from experience in the domain of life, however, does not depend upon our ability to understand the facts. I am certain that the wind blows, though I do not know "whence it cometh and whither it goeth." I am certain of the fact of my natural life, though I do not comprehend the method in which I came into being.

All life is its own demonstration. Thus the Christian life proves itself to be a life in the house of GOD our Father in the experience of millions who have acted upon the words of the Saviour Jesus, "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take My yoke upon you," a light and easy one in comparison with the heavy one of the Scribes and Pharisees, "and ye shall find rest unto your souls."<sup>4</sup> They have found this rest, which, however, is not one of death and despair such as Brâhmanism and Buddhism offer, but the full assurance of hope bestowed upon GOD's children, who know that here they are being but trained and fitted for the glorious life of the world to come, where each of them will be addressed with the words, "Well done, good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few

<sup>1</sup> Rom. viii., 28.<sup>2</sup> Ex. xv., 26.<sup>3</sup> Matt. xxii., 32.<sup>4</sup> John iii., 8.<sup>5</sup> Matt. xi., 28, 29.<sup>6</sup> Matt., xxv., 21.

things, I will set thee over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Christianity concerns itself with both body and soul. As Christianity does not confine itself to this present life but, according to the hope of GOD's children, embraces the future world and the glorification of the body, so even in this world it concerns itself with both soul and body, consecrating the entire man to GOD. For when the disciples on one occasion rebuked the women who brought their little children to Jesus that He might bless them, He reproved the disciples, saying, "Suffer<sup>1</sup> the little children to come unto Me; forbid them not; for of such is the Kingdom of GOD. Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of GOD as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein."

Some of the disciples thought that the Kingdom of GOD was a kingdom of worldly power and glory, and therefore did not concern children; others that it had necessarily to do with deep thoughts and knowledge, or with injunctions and moral demands of which innocent children know nothing. By taking these little ones up in His arms and blessing them, the Lord taught His disciples that GOD is more merciful and gentler than man, and that it is not infancy, weakness and lowliness that exclude from the Kingdom of Heaven, but only pride and an evil will. In this way, then, through Holy Baptism—that is through the baptism of water and the spirit—the nations of the earth, adults and children, are to be grafted into the true Vine, which is Christ; and even from the smallest plant, low and contemptible in the eyes of man, but incorporated into Him, there may spring through the nurturing of GOD's Spirit, a branch bearing much<sup>2</sup> fruit.

Thus in Christianity all growth and fruitfulness depend upon the branches abiding in and depending upon the Vine, which is Christ. While, however, the Christian thus leads a life above and beyond this world—"Our citizen-  
A Christian in the world. ship is in heaven,"<sup>3</sup>—yet he does not withdraw from the world and take refuge within<sup>1</sup> the walls of a

<sup>1</sup> Mark x., 13—16.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xxviii., 19, 20.

<sup>3</sup> Phil. iii., 20.

cloister or in a desert. On the contrary, he is a king and a ruler of the world. For—as the sway exercised by Christian nations over the world even now proves—it will yet be manifest that “The meek shall inherit the<sup>3</sup> earth.” This dominion of GOD’s children over the world, however, is apparent even now at the present time in the case of every individual Christian, so far as he follows in the footsteps of his Master Jesus, bearing witness both by word and deed to the love of GOD and to His Holy Will. Though such a walk with GOD in this life should end, as did that of Jesus Himself, upon the cross, yet the cross must become a sceptre that will overcome the world. This is indicated by the well-known saying that affirms that from the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Christian Church, which overcame the paganism of the world-ruling Romans.

Now what is true of great things is equally true of small ones in the Kingdom of GOD.

A Christian’s source of strength. Every Christian is engaged in his own part of the field and under his own particular circumstances in the victorious contest which Christianity is waging. The strength needed for his work, however, together with his confident expectation of victory, he ever draws from his union with Christ. This abiding in Christ becomes vital through prayer. Prayer, however, does not consist merely in calling upon GOD and Christ in time of trouble, or in giving thanks upon especial occasions, but is for the Christian a breathing of the life-giving air of the heavenly world, a looking up to the light which is above, which alone lightens this dark world here below. Many words, therefore, are not needed in prayer, since GOD knows what we need, and the Apostle’s command, “Pray<sup>1</sup> without ceasing” is not difficult to obey. Prayer is to the Christian what looking into his mother’s eyes is to the babe upon her knee,—the assurance “I am thine and thou art mine ; none can part us.” Even in the Old Testament GOD declares by His prophets, “Can<sup>2</sup> a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not

<sup>1</sup> Matt. v., 5.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Thes. v., 17.

<sup>3</sup> Isa. xlix., 15.

have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee."

Thus also, Christ has promised His people that where two or three are gathered together in His name, there He will be in the midst of them;<sup>1</sup> nay, at His departure from the earth, He promised to be with them all the days, even unto the end of the world,<sup>2</sup>—that is until the moment when He shall come again and establish the Kingdom of GOD in its glory. This presence of Jesus, the King, in His Kingdom takes place through His Word in the power of the Holy Spirit.

Moreover, in His love for the body of believers, which He Himself compares to the love of the bridegroom for the bride, in His love for the Church which He purchased with His own blood,<sup>3</sup> Christ does still more. For as a bridegroom sends to his bride, whom he has had to leave, tokens of love to comfort her for his absence until he returns to assure her of his love, so the Lord does to His Church which is waiting for Him. He does this, however, in a mysterious manner, as dear friends who know and understand each other are wont to do, while others who have no part in it perceive nothing, or see but trifling and folly. In bread and wine, the fruit of corn and of the vine, He grants to His own people, when gathered together for the Holy Meal which He instituted, the privilege of<sup>4</sup> spiritually partaking of His body and His blood, which He once offered upon the cross in order to purchase lost mankind as His property.

As these tokens cause the Church to look back in remembrance to the night in which her Master was betrayed and to the cross on which He gave His life for her, so do they also cause the Church to have a sure hope of everlasting life and of that glorious world in which the bridegroom and the bride shall be in wedlock united for ever. As, however, the sacrament of Holy Baptism is designed for children and converts who are given into Christ's care, so the sacrament of Holy

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xviii., 20.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xxviii., 20.

<sup>3</sup> Acts xx., 28.

<sup>4</sup> I have here changed the words of the original a little so as to make them accord better with the authorised language of the Church of England.—W. S. C. T.

Communion has a peculiar significance for those heavily afflicted by sin and evil, who obtain in it power, peace, and joy in the Holy<sup>1</sup> Ghost.

We shall understand this if we bear in mind that Jesus our Lord is the Good Shepherd who gave His life for the sheep; that He is King of His Kingdom, the Kingdom of GOD, who came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for<sup>2</sup> many.

Now since love such as this, by which the Highest humbles Himself, the innocent and Righteous One suffers for the guilty and sinners, and the King and Lord serves instead of the servants, certainly does not originate from sinful human nature, but is divine in its nature and heavenly in its origin,—it certainly cannot share the fate of all things human, namely remain in a state of death and pass away. Christ, the Holy One of GOD, though He tasted death, was not permitted to see corruption, but rose again the third day from the dead. For death has power only so far as sin extends. What is holy and sinless overcomes<sup>3</sup> death.

But that alone which is holy and sinless overcomes the world also. The power of that love which entered the world in Christ is the only power on earth to which everything must and ultimately will bow. The Apostle Paul, at a time when only a few small Christian congregations existed, wrote that GOD had highly exalted the Lord Jesus Christ, who had humbled Himself unto the death of the cross, to His own right hand, and had given Him a name at which all in heaven and on earth and under the earth should bow their<sup>4</sup> knees. This prophecy finds its fulfilment in the history of the world.

**Christ reveals GOD's Nature.** This enables us finally to draw a necessary conclusion with regard to the Nature of GOD from the nature and work of Christ, in whom GOD has revealed Himself. For from Nature, the creation of GOD, we can know only the omnipotence and the majesty of GOD the Creator, just as the subjects of a mighty king

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxvi., 26—29; 1 Cor. xi., 23—25.      <sup>2</sup> Mark x., 45.

<sup>3</sup> Acts ii., 25—33.

<sup>4</sup> Phil. ii., 8—11.

judge of his power and greatness by his grand robes and magnificent state. What use he will make of his power they know not. Thus the heathen, being restricted to the revelation of GOD in Nature, in some instances thought that GOD, like man, was benignant to-day and malignant to-morrow, just as the sky may be bright to-day and gloomy to-morrow. Or again they imagined that the deity was envious and begrudged the happiness of His creatures; or that being absorbed in bliss He cared not for them; or that He called men into existence and thrust them back again into nothingness as a sport. Or lastly, they fancied, as in the Buddhist system, that there was no GOD at all, and they stood mute in the presence of the inexplicable enigma of the existence of offering creation. Thus Nature cannot enable us to come to a definite conclusion with reference to GOD. In Christ, however, GOD has revealed His heart, His nature and His will.

Now we know that "GOD is Love."<sup>1</sup> And now we know that all the Divine Attributes manifested in creation, such as omniscience and wisdom, are only channels and means for the outpouring of His Divine love and mercy. We know that nothing in heaven and earth, neither<sup>2</sup> death nor life nor any other creature "can separate those who are in Christ as branches in the vine from the love of GOD, but that all things, yea even sin and death, must work together for good to them that love GOD." For the Almighty GOD, the Creator and Lord of all, has become in Christ our Father, who can give only good gifts to His children.<sup>3</sup>

It is clear from all we have said that in GOD we have to worship not a solitary Self, as Rationalists and Deists believe, but the mystery of Eternal Love, which Christendom adores as the Triune GOD, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Even creation itself, however, GOD's first revelation, permits us to perceive in the nature of man, who was created in the image<sup>4</sup> of GOD, a shadowing forth of the mystery of the Deity. We

<sup>1</sup> John iv., 8, 9.

Matt. vii., 11.; James i., 17.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. viii., 28, 31—39.

<sup>4</sup> Gen. i., 27.



learn from the revelation of GOD in Christ that GOD is the Father of us men only because He is in Himself the Father of the Eternal Son. Yet it is not through knowledge of the mystery of the Divine Existence, nor by speculation concerning the Divine Trinity, but by a believing reception of the Divine stream of love and life as it has been poured forth in Christ from the Triune GOD into the world, and which ever flows fresh and powerful when Christ is preached, that man is redeemed from sin and death.

#### CONTRAST WITH THE HINDU VIEW.

Thus enables us once more to direct our attention to the great contrast between the Christian and the heathen (and especially the Hindû) view of things. The point at issue is the contradiction between Optimism and Pessimism, which agitates the whole educated world. There is indeed an Optimism of frivolity and luxury, in contrast with which Christianity with its doctrines of sin, and death as the punishment of sin, may at first sight seem to be a gloomy Pessimism. It is this Optimism of frivolity and moral depravity that cries out to men, "Let us eat and drink," this is the essential part of life, "for to-morrow we die." Brâhmanism and Buddhism, in common with Christianity, preach the truth that death does not end all, but that eternal justice associates guilt in this world with punishment in the next.

All three religions again alike proclaim that man must not consider himself an isolated unit, nor must he seek satisfaction in himself alone. When it goes well with thee, thou mayst not and must not shut thine eyes to the sufferings of thy fellow men; the sufferings of others are *thy* sufferings, and what befalls them to-day may befall thee to-morrow. So then Christianity admits all the truth which underlies the Pessimistic view of the world inculcated by Brâhmanism and Buddhism. Whoever honours truth must also admit the truth which these religions teach of the transitory nature of things, of the delusion

Truths in  
Brahmanism  
and Buddhism.

of existence, of the evil of *Māyā* (illusion) which does not permit us to perceive by our senses things as they really are, as corruption and death, and which again is always deluding man into fancying that in the natural course of things all joy is turned into sorrow, all life into death. But beyond all this Christianity shews that the ultimate source of 'I evil is sin. That alone is a salutary Pessimism which acknowledges and abhors sin, the source of evil. Regarding this kind of Pessimism, Christ in one of His earliest utterances says, "Blessed" are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted."

What they cannot explain. What Bráhmaism and Buddhism, however, being confined to Nature and this lower world, are unable to explain is how this ever recurring delusion comes about, why everything continually tends to life and happiness, and why that which is dead always desires to live again. If modern Pessimism, in accordance with Buddhism, speaks of a "blind desire for life," it thereby renounces all rational explanation. Only by means of a truth which is united with it does the delusion become potent. Heathen Pessimism cannot acknowledge this truth, therefore also it is unable truly to recognise that illusion. Pessimism, which bases itself entirely on the nature of things, is and remains contrary to nature, for life and reality ever protest against it. The innate sense of youthful and unsophisticated man cannot but feel joy, and glory in life. Or are our poets but liars when they sing the glory of Nature and when they speak of spring-time and love and of a Golden Age? Just because the poets speak with no ulterior object in view, we may trust them rather than philosophers, who as a rule always advocate their own preconceived ideas and tendencies. Now poets exult in the glory and beauty of the world as deeply as they deplore its transitoriness and death. And it is indeed true that the last and highest poetry is tragic. But is this a proof of the verdict of Pessimism that death and annihilation are alone real? Nay rather, their<sup>1</sup> grief on account

of life vanishing away and their lamentation over death shew how real is joy and how precious is life.

**Contradiction in Life.** There is manifested in natural life a conflict, a contradiction, which must be admitted to be real,

and which cannot be removed merely by denying the existence of one of the contradictories. Christianity, however, being on a higher level of reality and truth, prevails over this contradiction. The natural order of things decides the dispute between death and life, sorrow and joy, in favour of death, in

**The transitory a figure of the eternal.**

as far as death is the end, and yet does not put an end to the contradiction, but rather makes it more clamorous. Christianity on the other hand settles the dispute in favour of life. Though all earthly things are transitory, yet in Christianity they become figures of higher things and prophecies of the abiding and the true. "GOD is not the God of the dead but of the living," and in Christ is the resurrection and the life.<sup>1</sup>

**Glory of Nature not a delusion.**

Christianity, with its hope of a future life and of the manifestation of the Kingdom of GOD in glory, proves that the life, the joy and the glory of Nature are not a mere phantom or a lie. For Nature and the natural man are the first creation, which is healed of its maladies of sin and death by the New Creation—Redemption in Christ,—and is delivered from the delusoriness of existence, that is to say its transitoriness. Thus all natural life becomes a type of the eternal and perfect life, and once more recovers the value of which its transitoriness had deprived it. The earthly becomes a prophecy of a future glorified world, in which righteousness and eternal life shall<sup>2</sup> reign.

In order to understand such a prophecy of eternal life and to be quite sure of it, a man must, of course, belong to the Kingdom of GOD and consequently possess eternal life. Whoever is grafted into the True Vine, which is Christ, and in Christ holds fast to the King of the glorified world, hears in all the life and in every motion of Nature the praise of the Creator and the prophecy of perfect redemption from all evil,

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxii. 32 ; John xi., 25.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. xv., 35, 39q.

notwithstanding transitoriness and death and the groaning of 'creation. For to the Christian this world, over which death reigns, is a great Training School, which will pass away and cease to exist when its purpose, the training of mankind, is accomplished.

Earthly things and the natural conditions of the present world are to the Christian not merely types and prophecies of the future eternal world, but they become even at the present time channels of a heavenly life, and are thus renewed and indeed "born again." After that mankind in the pagan state had separated itself into various nations, warring with and tyrannising over one another, Christianity made them members of one great family. When, in spite of this, wars and acts of violence take place, we know that these are consequences of man's sinful nature, and yet that like other calamities (such as famines, earthquakes and pestilences) they must conduce to the development of the Kingdom of GOD. Christianity, unlike Islâm, promotes no wars, but seeks to remove, as far as possible, all the frightful consequences of war, and that too without reference to any distinction between friend and enemy. Christianity desires that, in accordance with GOD's will, the nations should exist and flourish as independent members of the great human family, each developing its own peculiar, GOD-given talents. The uniting soul, as it were, of the great body of mankind is Christ.

As Christianity does not do away with national characteristics,—while Islâm, on the contrary, strove to form a despotic empire under the Khalifs as the successors of the "Prophet,"—so it does not obliterate social distinctions. Christendom has never been a monastic order like Buddhism. As there are always those who are richly endowed mentally, and others who have scanty gifts, so Christianity does not destroy all difference between rich and poor, high and low. But in teaching all men to pray, "Our Father, which art in Heaven," Christianity tells them all that they are brethren and sisters in<sup>2</sup> Christ. Buddhism, by

Christianity  
does not do  
away with  
social  
distinctions.

<sup>1</sup> Rom. viii., 22.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. vi., 9.

compelling men to become monks and to be poor, puts an end to the possibility of shewing compassion. When a man is deprived of his property by an established rule, the covetous desire is by no means removed from his heart, nor are love and benevolence implanted. The human race was from the beginning organised as a family to give and to receive. Christianity as the great gift of Him, Who, though<sup>1</sup> He was rich, yet for our sakes became poor, nay Who gave His life for us, inspires men with the spirit and feeling of mercy. Christianity does not deprive the rich of their possessions, but they ought to know that they are merely stewards of the good gifts of GOD, and that one day they will have to give an account of the use they have made of them.

**The Christian principle.** As we have said, Christianity does not abolish the distinction between rich and poor, but rather turns it into an incitement to mercy. Thus the distinction between master and servant, between high and low, between government and subject, remains. But all these mutual relations are by Christianity put under the dominion of the principle, "*Noblesse oblige*." Whoever owns any thing ought not to possess it so much for himself as for others. He to whom power and influence are given ought not to use them so much for his own advantage as for the benefit of others. Thus the great King of Prussia, who ruled in a despotic age and who had little sympathy with Christianity, yet in this sense declared of himself, "I am only the first *servant* of the State." Such fruit did Christianity produce in a king who in heart had turned away from it, as if he meant at least by doing his duty to show his respect for the words of Jesus to His disciples, "Ye<sup>2</sup> know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. Not so shall it be among you: but whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant: even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."

---

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. viii., 9.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xx., 25—28.

**Abolition of slavery.** Before Christianity abolished the slavery practised in the old pagan world, it made it bearable by making the masters Christian and merciful masters and the slaves faithful servants serving for GOD's sake. Thus not by law,—this in the condition of things which prevailed in ancient times would have meant a revolution,—but by spiritual means and the doctrine of Christian liberty, slavery gradually disappeared. Now as there will be masters and servants, those who command and those who obey, as long as the world lasts, the spirit and the disposition of mind in which people rule and serve respectively are much more important than the forms in which these positions manifest themselves. In a Christian nation the masters know that GOD the Lord watches and rules over them, and that through the redemption wrought out by Jesus Christ their servants are their brethren and like themselves members of the great body of Christ. On the other hand the servants know that in being faithful to their earthly masters they are faithful towards GOD.<sup>1</sup>

Through Christianity marriage and family life have been regenerated and sanctified, and have been exalted to be, as it were, a reflection and an antechamber of the Kingdom of GOD. Christianity alone most definitely and clearly places monogamy and Monotheism side by side. It is only in Christianity that woman is raised above the ignoble and unhappy position to which the sinful selfishness of the natural man has ever sought and will ever seek to degrade her, namely to serve as an instrument of pleasure and as a slave. It is true that the original order of creation and the ideal meaning of marriage, namely the living and dying for each other, not only the wife for the husband but also the husband for the wife, have prevailed in some pagan nations. Teutons and ancient Hindus

**Woman's position among ancient Hindus and Teutons.** resembled each other in this respect. How beautifully do instances of female faithfulness and self-sacrifice shine forth in Indian poetry and in Indian life! But while the woman is sacrificed for the man beyond human limit and Divine command, the man,

<sup>1</sup> Eph. vi., 5—9.



in comparison with the woman, is bound by no restraints. And those delicate blossoms of the noblest humanity which have unfolded themselves in the fields of Hindûstân as prophecies of what is yet to be, have been always destroyed by the wild flood of natural selfishness and boundless lust of the flesh. In nothing indeed does Islâm show more clearly its declension in the direction of Paganism and the natural man's slavery to the flesh than in the polygamy and especially in the general degradation of the female sex connected therewith. It is indeed in this very respect,—in matters which concern the preservation of the human race—that where Christian and Muhammadan nations dwell close to one another, the moral deterioration of the latter makes itself most clearly observable.

**Christ and His Church.** Within Christendom and on Christian ground, marriage is protected from such corruptions, for it has been made the type of the relation which subsists between Christ and the Church, that is to say redeemed<sup>1</sup> mankind. Christ is the Bridegroom and the Redeemer of the human race, and by giving Himself up to death for us He has established His claim to our love and obedience. According to the principle *noblesse oblige*, He who was high humbled Himself, He who was rich became poor, He who was the Lord became the servant. Hence the first thing that Christianity requires in marriage is that the husband be the support and the preserver of the wife, ready and willing to sacrifice his life for her sake. From this follows the obligation of the wife to serve and obey her husband as the Church does Christ. If one of the married couple opposes Christ's will and through the selfishness of the natural man ill-treats the other, divorce should by no means take place,—for Christ when He was rejected of men did not separate Himself from them,—but on the contrary the Christian consort must bear his or her cross, and with Christ's self-denying love seek to win over the other, as Christ does with regard to mankind. Thus marriage, an ordinance of Nature belonging to the first creation, becomes

---

<sup>1</sup> Eph. v., 22, 23.

a vehicle of the Holy and Heavenly Spirit, of the Spirit of Christ, and of the second creation.

What is true of marriage, the source of family life, is also true of the relation between parents and children. In Christ Jesus, GOD has become the Father of the children of men, has proved Himself to be a true Father, full of self-sacrificing love, by giving Himself in His dearly-beloved Son for the sake of mankind. The natural relation of parents to children must therefore be filled full of the holy love of GOD the Father,—love which patiently seeks His disobedient and lost children. In their parents, children have not only to obey those who gave them birth and who support them, but should in them be obedient to their Heavenly Father, and should, for GOD's sake, obey even<sup>1</sup> stern and unnatural parents.

Society,  
the State,  
Mankind.

Such are the fruits which by the influence of the spirit of Christianity, flourish in the province of natural life,—to which indeed marriage and family life belong. The blessing of Christianity, however, extends from the innermost sphere of the house and of the family to the great domain of Society, the State and mankind. No clearer proof of this is needed than the immense progress made by Christian nations in the departments of trade, agriculture, international communication and commerce, and the way in which they are drawing the rest of the world, with or without its own consent, into this system of development. There has dawned upon us a new and greater era in the government of the world and in the method of turning it to account. It is not as though these achievements were the direct consequences and gifts of Christianity. Christianity makes no discoveries in physical science, carries on no commerce, and wages no wars. It seeks rather to make men children of GOD, members of the great, invisible body of Christ, and heirs of the glorious world to come. But by doing this it at the same time makes men skilful and faithful in doing their duty in this world, in their daily callings. It teaches men to view this life as a preparatory school, as it were, for the other world,<sup>2</sup> and treats all

---

<sup>1</sup> Eph. vi., 1—4 ; Col. iii., 20, 21.

natural powers as talents which men must, in accordance with GOD's will, put out to usury for the benefit of mankind.

Now if Christian nations have received not only the Kingdom of Heaven and the invisible blessings of the world to come, but also the possession and dominion of this present world, then the words of Jesus addressed to His disciples have in their case been fulfilled in the most magnificent manner, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of GOD and His righteousness; and all these things,"—what belongs to the natural life,—"shall be added unto you."<sup>1</sup> As surely as these words have been fulfilled and are being fulfilled with regard to individual Christians as well as to whole nations, so surely, on the other hand, are the words of Jesus true and of great importance in reference to all men, "What shall a man be profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own self?"<sup>2</sup> There is only one Physician of souls, only one Redeemer and Saviour; this is Jesus Christ, Who said that He came "to give His life a ransom for many," and "to seek and to save that which was lost."<sup>3</sup>

**Christ's warnings.** Thus from the lips of Christ's messengers and witnesses, the preachers of the Gospel, there ever proceeds the warning addressed to all Christians, not to forget, for the sake of the world and the treasures it contains, their own souls and Him who is our eternal salvation, and not once more to tread in the steps of the Prodigal Son—as they formerly did when they were heathens,—accepting the gifts and treasures of the Father's house as far as temporal things were concerned, but forsaking their Father's house itself. If they do this, whether their course be short or long, its goal will be that of Ham.

To India and to all other countries, however, which have hitherto stood aloof from Christianity, but which are now being most earnestly invited to draw near, a similar warning is given. The grand development of the power and civilisation of the Christian nations is irresistibly advancing, and is paving the way for a new era of universal intercommunication and of making the most of this world. Let us think of what

<sup>1</sup> Matt. vi., 23.    <sup>2</sup> Matt. xvi., 26.    <sup>3</sup> Matt. xx., 28; Luke xix., 10.

happened a short time ago as regards Tunis and Egypt, and what is now taking place throughout the whole of Africa. Against this current of progress no nation on earth can for any length of time protect itself and preserve its full individuality. Now so far as it affects this necessary and irresistible process of Christian culture and civilisation, with its railways and telegraphs, with its schools and sciences, with its political and social institutions, Christian nations might observe this development without concern, knowing that under any circumstances this would take place. But these things are merely the body, the changeable and transitory portion of Christian civilisation: its immortal soul is Christianity. Our duty is to bring to the nations of the earth not merely earthly and perishable treasures but eternal realities. It is our duty to lead their souls to Christ the great Shepherd, Who has purchased them all unto Himself. The messengers of this Shepherd are those who preach the Gospel, that is to say the glad tidings of the great Shepherd. They obey His command to His disciples, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to the whole creation."<sup>1</sup> Freely<sup>2</sup> ye have received, freely give." This is not a matter connected with earthly dominion, with earthly business and profit. Missionary work is the response to that love of Jesus Christ which caused Him to die for our sins. As He has loved us, so ought we to love our brethren.<sup>3</sup>

Christianity does not deprive the nations of their special characteristics, nor of their language, nor of their national customs, if these be truly human and not soul-destroying.

What diversity there is among the Christian nations of Europe! India, also, and her various peoples, are destined to become noble members of the great Christian body. It is not yet too late. In GOD's kingdom it often holds good that "The first shall be last and the last first." Those who at a later hour begin to labour in the Lord's vineyard, are welcomed equally with those who enter<sup>4</sup> earlier.

<sup>1</sup> *Mat.* xvi., 15.

<sup>2</sup> *Mat.* x., 8.

<sup>3</sup> *1 John* iv., 19—21.

<sup>4</sup> *Mark* x., 31.

<sup>5</sup> *Mat.* xx., 1—16.

**The lesson  
India needs.** What India has to learn is, that it is not enough to share in the great world-wide civilisation which is represented by Christian nations. Whoever thinks that it is, does not see the best blessing which Providence is at the present time offering to India, the only thing by which time is exalted to eternity. And if on the other hand there are many who are dissatisfied with the degree of the development of civilisation in their country, and desire higher social and political progress, such as a land with such a glorious past may justly claim, they should bear in mind the words of Christ, "Seek<sup>3</sup> ye first the Kingdom of GOD and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."

---

<sup>1</sup> Matt. vi., 23.

# INDEX.

	PAGE
<b>Adityas</b> , connection of, with Varuna ... ..	66
<b>Adonis</b> , or Tammuz, Myth of ... ..	49
„ Worship of ... ..	50
<b>Æsop</b> , Fables of ... ..	17
<b>Agriculture</b> due to Hamites ... ..	6
„ Carthaginian ... ..	6
„ Book of Nabathæan ... ..	7
„ in Egypt ... ..	7
„ among Indo-Europeans ... ..	57
<b>Amazons</b> , Probable origin of legend of ... ..	53
<b>Amshaspands</b> of Zarathustra Religion ... ..	66
<b>Ancient World</b> ... ..	153-180
„ Relative Antiquity of Nations of ... ..	1
„ Goal of... ..	161-180
„ its progress to Goal ... ..	173
„ its Goal reached ... ..	175
„ Failure of ... ..	182
<b>Animals</b> , Worship of among Egyptians ... ..	31
„ killed for sacrifice ... ..	219
<b>Aphrodite</b> , Hamitic Origin of ... ..	72
<b>Apollo</b> , The Vatican ... ..	70
„ Immortality of ... ..	71
<b>Arabs</b> ... ..	85-89 and 102-106
„ their origin ... ..	86
„ Architecture of .. ...	89
„ compared with Hebrews ... ..	89
„ Distinctions among ... ..	102
„ Monotheism of ... ..	102
„ Influence of local Cults on ... ..	104
„ resist Hamitic Religion ... ..	138
<b>Architecture</b> , Mesopotamian and Assyrian ... ..	20
„ Arabian ... ..	89
<b>Art</b> of Egypt and Assyria ... ..	18
„ Origin among Hamites ... ..	134
„ in Homer's time ... ..	135



	PAGE
<b>Art</b> Greek power of remodelling ... ..	135
„ Advance of, among Greeks ... ..	162
„ and poetry reveal ideals ... ..	204
<b>Aryans</b> ... ..	55-60
„ Affinity of Tribes of ... ..	55
„ Migration of ... ..	55
„ Earliest condition of ... ..	56
„ Agriculture and cattle-breeding among ... ..	57
„ Family life of ... ..	58
„ Political life of ... ..	59
„ their talents at first latent ... ..	59
„ Early civilization of ... ..	81
„ borrow from and surpass Hamites ... ..	82
„ Era of ... ..	155
„ <b>Religion of</b> ... ..	60-83
„ „ idea of the Divine ... ..	60
„ „ Varuna worship ... ..	62
„ „ Character of deities ... ..	67
„ „ their deities lack sex ... ..	71
„ „ „ contrasted with men ... ..	73
„ „ Death not a punishment .. ..	75
„ „ powers of evil ... ..	75
„ „ Strife among deities ... ..	76
„ „ deities limited in power . ... ..	76
„ „ Divine conceptions lowered ... ..	77
„ „ Spiritual and Ideal, not the Material, Divine ... ..	71
„ „ The Gods are good ... ..	80
„ „ union with Hamitism ... ..	164
<b>Assurbanipal</b> , Library of ... ..	15
<b>Assyria</b> , Painting and sculpture of ... ..	18
„ Architecture of ... ..	20
„ The Hercules of ... ..	45
<b>Baal</b> , Phœnician deity, the Greek Adonis ... ..	49
<b>Babel</b> , Tower of ... ..	121
<b>Babylon and Nineveh</b> ... ..	38-48
„ Antiquity of ... ..	2
„ Duodecimal system derived from ... ..	10
„ Calendar of ... ..	12
„ Literature of ... ..	15
„ and Nineveh, Civilization of ... ..	38
„ <b>Religion of</b> ... ..	39-48
„ „ its cosmogony, Berosus' account of ... ..	39
„ „ God Bel ... ..	40
„ „ Nature of Divine... ..	41
„ „ The deity, Death connected with .. ..	42

	PAGE
Babylon, Religion of, The Mesopotamian Pantheon...	43
"    "    Sun, moon and stars ...	44
Bel, Babylonian god ...	40
"    Grave of ...	42
Berosus, priest at Babylon ...	38
"    quoted ...	112
Brahmo-Samaj, &c., Japhethism ...	207
Brahmanism ...	140-145
"    among Hindus ...	140
"    Hamitism of ..	141
"    Root idea of ..	144
"    Truths in...	232
Buddha, founder of Buddhism .	145
Buddhism...	143-151
"    Rise of ...	143
"    Root idea of ...	144
"    a reaction against Brahmins...	145, 147
"    its aim ...	147
"    its theory of existence after death ...	148
"    its ethics negative ...	149
"    a Japhethic reaction against Hamitism ...	150
"    Pessimism of ...	150
"    Truths in ...	232
Cæsar, Worship of ...	170
"    second Adam ...	173
"    universal deity ...	174
Calendar, Babylonian ...	12
Canaanites, Human sacrifices of ...	51
Carthage, Agriculture of ...	6
"    Literature of ...	14
Caste, Hamitic origin of ...	22
"    in Egypt and India ...	37
China, Early civilization of ...	4
Christianity ...	181-242
"    contrasted with Egyptian belief ...	36
"    not spread by war ...	185
"    apostacy from, a retrogression ..	186
"    and Civilization ...	189
"    brought new life ...	191
"    Substance of ...	213
"    not of European growth ...	216
"    Effects of, admired ...	221
"    no mere moral system ..	224
"    concerned with body and soul ...	227
"    Personal source of strength in ..	228

	PAGE
<b>Christianity</b> contrasted with Hindu view ... ..	232
" and social life ... ..	235
" and slavery... ..	237
" and woman ... ..	237
" influence of, on national progress ... ..	239
" does not destroy National Characteristics ... ..	241
<b>Cities</b> , Founding of ... ..	8
<b>Civilization</b> , Chief ancient centres of ... ..	1
" Essential oneness of earliest ... ..	5
" Advance of ... ..	9
" among early Indo-Europeans ... ..	56, 81
" of Semites ... ..	87
" derived from Hamites ... ..	128
" passage of, to Europe ... ..	129
" Relation of Hamitic to Semitic... ..	137
" Development of Indian ... ..	140
" of ancient world, finally Græco-Roman ... ..	173
" <b>Modern</b> , Progress of ... ..	186-191
" not an end in itself ... ..	187
" Christian ... ..	188
" not Christianity ... ..	190
" without Christ ... ..	192
" Present system of ... ..	207
" Christian, conquering world ... ..	215
<b>Coinage</b> , Weights and Measures ... ..	10
" invented by Asiatic Greeks ... ..	11
<b>Cronos or Saturn</b> and Moloch .. ..	130
<b>Darwinism</b> , Hamitism of ... ..	197
<b>Death</b> not connected with sin by early Indo-Europeans ... ..	75
<b>Deification</b> of man connected with his degradation ... ..	175, 179
<b>Dionysus</b> , connection with Hamitism ... ..	132
<b>Drama</b> , origin of... ..	133
<b>Duodecimal system</b> , Babylonian origin of ... ..	10
<b>Earth</b> , Aryan view of its relation to gods ... ..	76
<b>Egypt</b> ... ..	1-20
" Antiquity of ... ..	1
" Rise of sciences and agriculture in ... ..	7
" Industries of ... ..	9
" Literature of ... ..	15
" Animal fables of... ..	17
" Painting and sculpture in ... ..	18
" The pyramids of .. ..	19
" <b>Religion</b> of ... ..	26-38
" Osiris ... ..	27
" Duality of sex in ... ..	29

	PAGE
<b>Egypt, Religion of, birth, suffering and death of deity</b> ... ..	30
"    "    animal worship ... ..	31
"    "    Nature life deified... ..	32
"    "    worship of Pharaoh ... ..	32
"    "    ideas of next life ... ..	33
"    "    transmigration of Souls ... ..	34
"    "    judgment of the dead ... ..	35
"    "    contrast to Christian doctrine ... ..	36
"    "    compared with Indian Pantheism .. ..	37
<b>Ethiopia, Antiquity of</b> ... ..	2
<b>Euhemerus, Teaching of</b> ... ..	167
<b>Fables, Æsop's</b> ... ..	17
<b>Genealogical Table of Nations in Genesis</b> ... ..	110
<b>Genesis, Genealogical Table of Nations in</b> ... ..	110
<b>Germany, Poets and musicians of</b> ... ..	202
"    Ennobled Japhethism of ... ..	203
<b>God, Evolution of the purpose of</b> ... ..	214-223
"    Man's need of and relation to ... ..	223-232
"    Nature of, revealed by Christ ... ..	230
<b>Greeks, Asiatic, invent Coinage</b> ... ..	11
"    Hamitic influence on Myths of ... ..	69, 72, 162
"    Idealism of ... ..	78
"    Exclusiveness of, differs from that of Jews ... ..	109
"    Hamitic influence on culture of ... ..	130
"    Remodelling power of, in Art... ..	135
"    Science and philosophy of ... ..	136, 162
"    Vice and its effects on ... ..	163
"    Lowering of marriage among ... ..	164
"    Religion of ... ..	67-78
"    leading idea of the divine ... ..	68
"    Conceptions of deity ... ..	69
"    divine conceptions shown in sculpture ... ..	70
"    their gods immortal ... ..	71
"    Female deities of ... ..	72
"    Hamitic influence on ... ..	130
"    Man deified... ..	165
<b>Ham, Tendency of, family</b> ... ..	114-126
"    meaning of Name... ..	115
"    original tendency of character ... ..	119
<b>Hamites, Civilization of...</b> ... ..	1-24
"    Great antiquity of ... ..	1
"    never savage or nomadic ... ..	4
"    Agriculture due to ... ..	6
"    Literature of ... ..	14
"    Political institutions of ... ..	20

	PAGE
<b>Hamites</b> , Absolute monarchism of .. ...	21
" Caste borrowed by India from .. ...	22
" royalty among divine .. ...	23
" Contest of, with Semites .. ...	85
" Languages of, early decline .. ...	113
" Tendencies of .. ...	114-126
" Attempts of, at universal Monarchy .. ...	120
" first form a state .. ...	221
" contrasted in Old Testament with Semites .. ..	123
" Noah's curse on .. ...	125
" relations of, with Semites and Japhethites ..	127-151
" Civilization derived from .. ..	128
" Collapse of Nations of, .. ...	55
<b>Hamitism</b> ... ..	127-151
" Influence of, on Greek Myths .. ...	69
" " " Semitic religion .. ...	100
" Origin of .. ...	122
" Extent of influence of .. ...	127
" influence on Greeks .. ...	130
" " Greek religion .. ...	131
" sign of influence .. ...	132
" Art derived from .. ..	134
" influence on Semitic civilization .. ...	137
" resisted by Israelites and Arabs .. ...	138
" influence on Brahmanism... ..	141
" " Greek philosophy .. ...	142
" Contrast of earlier and later .. ...	146
" influence on Rome .. ...	169
" in modern Pantheism and Materialism .. ...	193, 196, 200
<b>Hebrews</b> , <i>see</i> <b>Israelites</b> .	
<b>Hegel</b> , Pantheism of .. ...	197
<b>Hercules</b> , The Assyrian... ..	45
" Greek and Hamitic views of .. ...	68
<b>Human sacrifices</b> of Phœnicians and Canaanites .. ...	51, 189
" development, uniformity of, contradicted by history ..	79
" " View of " Liberalism " concerning .. ...	210
" race, Goal of, Ch., VIII. .. ...	181, 242
" " one body, many members .. ...	181
" " Divine purposes in History of .. ...	182
" " God's Salvation for .. ...	183
" " Christ the head of .. ...	184
" " " Liberalist " view of .. ...	210
<b>Iapetos</b> connected with Japheth .. ...	116
" Guilt of .. ...	123
" Sons of .. ...	124

	PAGE
<b>India</b> , religions in ... ..	140-151
" Pantheism of, Hamitic ... ..	143.
" Modern Theistic Movement in ... ..	212
" <i>see</i> <b>Brahmanism and Buddhism.</b>	
<b>Indians</b> and <b>Iranians</b> a branch of <b>Indo-Europeans</b> ... ..	58
<b>Indo-Europeans</b> , <i>see</i> <b>Aryans.</b>	
<b>Industries</b> of <b>Egypt</b> and <b>Babylon</b> ... ..	9
<b>Ishmael</b> , his inheritance ... ..	102
<b>Islam</b> , Character of ... ..	106
" no progress in Arts, &c. through ... ..	88
" Mixed nature of ... ..	106
" spread by war ... ..	185
<b>Israelites</b> .. ... ..	89-102, 216-221
" Antiquity of ... ..	1
" compared with <b>Arabs</b> ... ..	89
" their borrowing from <b>Hamites</b> ... ..	90
" their heroes not perfect .. ...	95
" Connection of, with other <b>Semitic</b> races ... ..	99
" alone assert the common origin of all Nations ... ..	108
" Exclusiveness of, contrasted with that of <b>Greeks</b> ... ..	109
" resist <b>Hamitic</b> Religion ... ..	138
" an indestructible race ... ..	154
" their relation to <b>Ham</b> and <b>Japheth</b> ... ..	156
" their Mission... ..	216
" in <b>Canaan</b> a type ... ..	218
" their nation a prophecy .. ..	220
" Religion of ... ..	92-99
"   " <b>Monotheistic</b> ... ..	92
"   " their deity holy ... ..	92, 95
"   "   " above <b>Nature</b> ... ..	93
"   " Character of ... ..	94
"   " God and revelation ... ..	96
"   " Prophets of .. ...	217
"   " Sacrifices of ... ..	219
<b>Japheth</b> , Tendency of family of ... ..	114-128
" meaning of name ... ..	115
" Connection of, with <b>Iapetos</b> ... ..	116
" <b>Noah's</b> blessing on ... ..	125
<b>Japhethism</b> ennobled in <b>Germany</b> ... ..	203
<b>Japhethic School</b> ... ..	206-214
" not wholly to be rejected ... ..	208
" Fate of ... ..	209
<b>Jews</b> , <i>see</i> <b>Israelites.</b>	
<b>Kant</b> , Categorical imperative of ... ..	203
" his views a contrast to <b>Darwinism</b> ... ..	204



	PAGE
"Liberalism," its view of the world's progress	210
Literature among Hamites	14
" Egyptian and Babylonian	14
" its value	16
" Medical	17
Macedonian Empire	158
Manetho, Egyptian priest	38
Marriage, Lowering of, among Greeks	164
" " " Romans	168
Materialism, Modern, unveiled Hamitism	193, 196
" and Idealism	196
Mesopotamia, Architecture of	20
" Pantheon of	43
" Many elements in population of	112
Moloch, <i>see</i> Hercules	45
Monarchy, Absolute, Hamitic	21
Monotheism, Relation of, to polytheism	65
" of Israelites	92, 100
" of Arabs	102
" Influence of local cults on	104
Moral law in Old Testament	221
" " New	222
Muhammad a prophet	104
Mylitta, Repulsive worship of	41
Mythology, Modern theories of, one-sided	81
Navigation among Phœnicians...	12
Nineveh, <i>see</i> Babylon.	
Ninus, Myth of	46
Nirvana, Meaning of	148
Omoroca, name explained	40
Ormazd, Religion of	64
Osiris, The myth of, and its characteristics	27
" the sun God	29
Pantheism and Caste in India	39
" of India Hamitic	143
" Modern, unveiled Hamitism	193
Persians saved Israel	154
" their feelings towards Israel	156
" their internal polity	157
Pessimism opposes Pantheism	199
Philology reveals philosophy and poetry	82
Philosophy among Greeks	136, 162
Phœnicians, Development of later than that of Babylon and	
Egypt	2
contrasted with Egyptians	5

	PAGE
<b>Phœnicians</b> Progress of, in navigation, &c. ... ..	12
" Alphabet of ... ..	13
" Absence of literature among ... ..	14
" Religion of ... ..	48
" chief deity Baal ... ..	49
" Human sacrifices among ... ..	51
<b>Polytheism</b> of some Semites, transition to ... ..	100
<b>Prahrada</b> , Prayer of ... ..	198
<b>Punishments</b> after death, Egyptian view of ... ..	34
<b>Pyramids</b> , The Egyptian ... ..	19
" of Babylon ... ..	42
" their uses ... ..	42
<b>Rome</b> ... ..	158-161, 167-180
" Rule of ... ..	158
" Two-fold character of ... ..	169
" gladiatorial exhibitions ... ..	176
" treatment of criminals ... ..	178
" Degeneracy of ... ..	167
" The state and religion of ... ..	168
" Decay of State in ... ..	169
" Hamitised ... ..	169-180
" Cæsar worship of ... ..	470-175
" deification of woman ... ..	172
" last step in evolution of ... ..	173
<b>Sardanapalus</b> , Myth of ... ..	47
" Statues of ... ..	48
<b>Schopenhauer</b> , Pessimism of ... ..	199
<b>Sciences</b> , Use of ... ..	7
" among Greeks ... ..	136
<b>Semiramis</b> , her character ... ..	46
<b>Semites</b> ... ..	85-106
" Early localisation of ... ..	85
" their rivalry with Hamites ... ..	85
" Tribes of ... ..	86
" Civilisation of ... ..	87
" their genius not creative ... ..	91
" Connection of Israel with other nations of ... ..	99
" Transition to Polytheism of some ... ..	100
" not deserted by God ... ..	101
" in Arabia ... ..	102
" their civilisation in relation to that of Hamites ... ..	137
<b>Semitic religion</b> ... ..	92-108
" Monotheism of ... ..	92, 100
" Influence of Hamitism on ... ..	100
<b>Sex</b> , Aryan & ties lack conception of ... ..	71

	PAGE
Sex of deities, Interchange of ... ..	52
Shakespeare ... ..	204
Shem, Tendency of family of ... ..	114-126
„ name unexplained ... ..	115, 117
Slavery connected with deification of man ... ..	175
State, First formation of ... ..	121
Strauss, David Friedrich, "The Old Faith and the New" ... ..	194
„ his work disavowed ... ..	201
Substitution, Life of man dependent on ... ..	216
Teutons, Gods of, not immortal ... ..	73
Transmigration of souls, Egyptian doctrine of ... ..	34
„ „ in India derived from Hamites ... ..	141
Typhon, Egyptian deity ... ..	36
Varuna, Worship of ... ..	62
„ a moral force ... ..	62
„ Worship of, common to all Indo-European tribes ... ..	64
„ and Adityas ... ..	66
Writing, Invention of ... ..	12
„ hieroglyphics, &c. ... ..	13
„ Phœnician alphabet ... ..	13
Zoroastrianism, Rise of... ..	64